

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. CXLII. JANUARY 1911.

ART. I.—MR. GLADSTONE'S LETTERS ON CHURCH
AND RELIGION.

Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone. Selected and arranged by D. C. LATHBURY.
Two Volumes. (London : John Murray, 1910.)

WE are a good deal puzzled as to what to say of these volumes, or rather, as to how to say it. They consist (apart from a miscellaneous Appendix) of 464 Letters 'on Church and Religion' covering the entire period of Mr. Gladstone's life. They have been 'selected and arranged' by the Editor. The selection, we doubt not, has been carried out with care and judgement; and has involved, it need scarcely be said, considerable labour. These volumes may be trusted as containing within their covers most of what is noteworthy and memorable in Gladstone's correspondence on the matters of religion. The letters are, of course, a selection of a selection. They represent only one department of an extraordinarily full and varied life. They deal with a single body of interests, and that which took deepest hold of the writer. They have a natural unity, such as should issue from the action of a strong, progressive, consistent mind, unflagging in its concern and zeal. They have, we should suppose, a natural order, the simple one of time. Mr. Gladstone was proud to acknowledge himself 'a learner all my life'; and these letters should exhibit, month by month and year by year, the steps and stages of his advance. The student of contemporary religious movements and

thought could desire nothing better than the opportunity of approaching them, in their fresh unfolding, from the point of view of a protagonist so fervent in spirit, so alert in mind.

Unfortunately, in any such endeavour, he will get little help from these volumes. The Editor, having carried out, conscientiously and intelligently, the labour of selecting, has proceeded further to 'arrange.' We quite acknowledge that in any encyclopaedic work on Gladstone and his times arrangement would have a very necessary place. We should be prepared to find an account of his Budget speeches and of his Homeric studies in different volumes, or in different parts of the same volume. In his study at Hawarden, the much-loved 'Temple of Peace,' he had two large writing-tables, one reserved for political, the other for every other form of reading, correspondence, and literary work. He possessed, in a very high degree, the faculty of concentration; he found rest and refreshment in turning, at will, from one great interest to another. Accustomed as he was to work in compartments, the partitions between them were never artificial, but such as the nature of the subject prescribed. Within any compartment—the Church and Religion, for example—there is always an organic unity of thought and purpose. Especially is this the case with regard to Religion. It is possible to take a bundle of these letters and label them 'Church and State'; and to take another bundle and label them 'Oxford Movement'; and to make up a third bundle as 'Controversy with Rome'; and to intersperse them with various minor bundles appropriately labelled; but it is not possible to obscure the fact that they were written consecutively, throughout the same period, as the outcome of one train of thought, one trend of aspiration, one strain of effort. The only effect of 'arranging' them, after the fashion of these volumes, is to render their visible unity almost impossible to trace in detail; or, in other words, to render the volumes almost impracticable for any serious student. Nobody wants, either in regard to religion or anything else, to be made acquainted with Gladstone's mind in a state of compound fracture. It is possible, of course, by setting to

work with a sheaf of bookmarkers, a sheet of foolscap, and a liberal supply of time and temper, to piece together the correspondence of a particular year; and so, by reading the letters as they were written, to read the writer's mind. Surely it is this last that matters. Interesting intrinsically as these letters are, their real value is in the light they throw upon the personality of the writer, and upon the day-to-day progress of the causes in which he bore a part. With that in view they are more than worthy of permanent record. Let alone, they tell their own tale, and one of absorbing interest; 'arranged,' after the manner of a book of ready reference, they tell no intelligible tale at all. After striving, we think manfully, to get a satisfactory impression from these volumes, and being baffled by the procedure adopted, we turned to the Preface in quest of an explanation. There it is given in all simplicity. 'The selection now printed,' we read,

'covers a period of more than sixty years. It deals almost wholly with a single subject, but it is a subject which takes many forms and appeals, with varying force, to many publics. For this reason it has seemed best to arrange the letters under the several heads to which they relate, and to take these heads in the order of their first appearance in the correspondence.'

Well and good, if Gladstone's letters are good for nothing but as raw material for the elaborate book-journalism now so much in vogue; if the only thought is to serve them up, in a form the handiest and least provocative of thought, for the entertainment of the 'many publics.' For ourselves we suspect that the publics in question have other and easier material to occupy them; and that a mistake has been made in overlooking the needs of those, surely not a few, who will turn to these volumes as to a fresh mine of knowledge about Gladstone and his age. Suppose such a one desires to follow Mr. Gladstone's progress during the great formative period of his life, say the forty years from 1835 to 1874. He will find the letters relating to the period in ten different sections. He will find the most significant passages bearing upon the matter of one section in letters distributed among other

sections. He will find 83 letters on 'Church and State' in Vol. I. 23-170; 68 letters inscribed 'Oxford Movement' in I. 232-399; 12 letters, 'Oxford Elections,' in II. 7-22; 16 letters, under 'Controversy with Rome,' in II. 26-62. He will find that this classification, to which the procession of interest, the sequence of thought, is wholly sacrificed, is itself entirely superficial, accidental, insubstantial, artificial, the merest verbal lath and plaster. The subjects of these letters overlap and interlace and commingle almost inextricably, repudiating at every step the sectionalizing process. Their very interest and value lies in the fact that they body forth, on very diverse occasions, one point of view, one manner of approach, one method of treatment, one growing and ripening principle and conviction. It is this which the serious reader will endeavour to trace, if the effort to re-dispose these letters in the order of nature is not too much for him.

We shall attempt to deal, in this article, with only one topic in any detail. The first great interest of this correspondence is Mr. Gladstone's concern with the then burning problem of Church and State, and his connexion with the Oxford Movement. We entirely refuse to take these things in separation, and these letters warrant the refusal. Mr. Lathbury truly says¹ that 'in one, and that a very real, sense, Mr. Gladstone was never a Tractarian.' This was just because, so far as the hold upon principles went, he was Tractarian before the Tracts; and when the Tract writers assumed, as they could hardly help assuming, the aspect of a party, Gladstone, whose avocations were elsewhere, whose mind was travelling in freedom along a parallel course, and who hated the whole spirit of party in relation to religion and the Church, felt the need to preserve, and to insist upon, his own personal detachment and independence. It was only when the Movement began to get into difficulties, not a few of which, as he thought, were of its own creation, that Gladstone appears as an active adherent; and then only on occasion, as the champion of men and principles who were being subjected, he believed, to unjust aspersion and

¹ I. 264.

attack. He comes in not so much on the side of Tractarianism as of fair play. At the same time, while holding deliberately his place apart, his own chosen work—the endeavour to impress sound Church principles, first positively and then negatively, upon the action of the State—could have had neither hope nor issue apart from the Movement which was proceeding contemporaneously; and Gladstone's own full sense of this was sufficient to make him, if a pained critic of its less responsible developments, none the less an ardent sharer of its aims, a keen spectator of its fortunes.

He has told us how, in the early summer of 1832, during a few months spent in foreign travel immediately after leaving Oxford, 'one Sunday (May 13) something, I know not what, set me on examining the Occasional Offices of the Church in the Prayer-book'; and how, nurtured until then in Evangelical pietism, he received, from this experience, his

'first introduction to the august conception of the Church of Christ. It presented to me Christianity under an aspect in which I had not yet known it: its ministry of symbols, its channels of grace, its unending line of teachers joining from the Head: a sublime construction, based throughout upon historic fact, uplifting the idea of the community in which we live, and of the access which it enjoys through the new and living way to the presence of the Most High. From this time I began to feel my way by degrees into or towards a true notion of the Church.'¹

The extracts from Gladstone's diary given in Lord Morley's *Life* shew how, in the reading and reflection of the succeeding years—including within its scope his especial heroes Augustine and Dante—this strong original impression was deepened and fortified; it attained to full solidity and definition from the study of Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, a work upon which, notwithstanding limitations, he set the highest value to the end of his life.

It was fourteen months after 'that first disclosure of 1832' that Keble, in his Assize Sermon on National Apostasy, gave the signal for action to his friends at Oxford, and steps

¹ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, i. 87.

were taken towards the publication of the Tracts. 'I did not see the Tracts,' Mr. Gladstone wrote long afterwards,¹ 'and to this hour I have read but few of them. Indeed, my first impressions and emotions in connexion with it [the Movement] were those of indignation at what I thought the rash intemperate censures pronounced by Mr. Hurrell Froude upon the Reformers.' With the instinct of leadership strong within him, he was engaged in beating out his own convictions; living in the large world, in the full tide of politics—he was Under-Secretary for the Colonies at the age of twenty-five—he touched the Movement mainly through two friends, both, unlike himself, its converts and disciples. 'In the course of two or three years' after the Movement began, 'Manning turned from a strongly evangelical attitude to one as strongly anglican, and about the same time converted his acquaintance with me into a close friendship. In the same manner James Hope, whom I had known but slightly at Eton or Oxford, made a carefully considered change of the same kind; which also became the occasion of a fast friendship. Both these intimacies led me forward.'²

In a letter to Manning, dated March 29, 1837, we are enabled to see, better than anywhere else, his actual concern with the Movement, and the province of action which he had chosen for himself in relation to it. The letter, we may say in passing, is numbered 377 in Mr. Lathbury's collection; and is separated by 646 pages from another letter numbered 2, written, on substantially the same subject, to the same correspondent, just four days later. Part of the letter is worth quoting at length:

'I fully believe with you that there is in the public councils of this realm, and especially in the House of Commons, where, after all, the brunt of the social battle is to be borne, a "most blessed calling" open to us, a work which does indeed cry aloud for men to work it, and that is the application of the searching test of Christian Catholic principles to those numerous measures of the time which are in form or substance or both calculated to bear powerfully on religion. But there are few men in the

¹ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, i. 161.

² *Ibid.*

kingdom the joint state of whose minds and hearts would permit them to discharge that function : and I fear their mental composition is for the most part of too fine a texture readily to undergo the rude handling of a popular election, and the subsequent contact with party combinations and with every form of worldly motive. It must require a large gift of grace, to have strength to carry unharmed through the crowd so precious and so delicate a burden. It is no reproach to our party leaders that they fail to develope in their public speeches what the study and the cloister have only rewrought out in this country within the few last years : for I think that that form of Christian feeling we now want as applicable to statesmanship, involving a mixed and justly proportioned regard to the body and spirit of institutions, is one different from personal piety even where combined with intellect, still more different from any combination of secular motives, only realised by a few persons under the most favourable circumstances, requiring time to spread over and tinge the general sentiment of the nation, and less likely to prevail in proportion as persons are in contact firstly with the excitements, secondly with that pressure of detail, which are the accompaniments of all politics, but especially so of those of our own day and time. And let me observe this further : there is a great obstacle to this development in the peculiar nature of that description of speaking which is required in the present day. It is not now as it was in ancient times, when the orator addressed his audience from the elevation of a mental bema as well as a physical one ; he must now stand upon the floor—believe me this is no fanciful analogy—he must, having the part of a debater in the House of Commons to discharge, place himself upon a level with his audience, his mind with their minds ; study their accessibilities accurately and narrowly, seek to lead their wills and not trust to a tone of command, to a mere display of intellectual power, or to the influence of rank or character or experience, in anything like the same degree to which it would formerly have been safe. In fine, it is of the character of a debater to be peculiarly subject to impressions from his audience, to be passive before and while he is active, to be oppressed by the sense of their antipathy while he is seeking to rouse or create their sympathy. Now if this be true, and, as all the world knows, the standard of the religious sympathies of the House of Commons, is not the distance immeasurable between that frame of mind, and that frame of language, in which a debater can be intelligible, so to speak, to this audience, and those on the other hand in which he

must needs be himself in order fully to realize the conception of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church ?

‘For myself I avow that, taught as I have been in a sound and also an awakened University, and blest as I am with friends who, from positions less disturbed, supply me from time to time with views of unmaimed and uncontaminated truth, it were a sin indeed if I did not look forward with desire at least, though with slender hope, to a struggle with these difficulties ; but it would also be a blindness grosser than that of which I am conscious if I did not see that I have never yet succeeded at all in carrying myself upward during a speech to that region of pure principle, and at the same time retaining the sympathy of the hearers. When the handling of obvious and everyday considerations is at an end, and when after the time for argument should come the time to rise into the expression of feeling, I cannot describe to you the sensation of faintness and incapacity which oppresses the mind ; it tries to fly, and finds itself laden with wings of lead, and the only refuge of the tongue is in some bald and general commonplaces. This is sad truth : and yet what you say is true, that, so far as the principle of an Establishment is perceived in the House of Commons, on our side at least, it is honestly, warmly, loyally, felt by a class of men either religious or at least high-minded, and they will always respond even to the feeblest appeal upon such a subject.’¹

The sensation of faintness and incapacity of which Gladstone here speaks is reflected in not a few passages in his diary. But there was nothing faint about his grasp of those principles for which he aimed at securing recognition in the action of the State. He desired that that recognition should be active and uncompromising ; and it was with prolonged searching of heart, both as to the future of politics and his own concern with it, that he came gradually to see that the modern State, altering in character daily around him, was incapable any longer of such a recognition. To this fact his eyes were opened, finally and for good, by the reception accorded to his book, *The State in its Relations with the Church*, published in 1838. “Scarcely had my work issued from the press,” wrote Mr. Gladstone thirty years later, “when I became aware that there was no party, no section

¹ II. 234.

of a party, no individual person probably, in the House of Commons, who was prepared to act upon it. I found myself the last man on a sinking ship."'¹ This sounds like an echo of a passage in a letter to Newman written much nearer the event (April 19, 1845).²

'According to the old European and Christian civilization (to go no farther back), the State was a family, and the governors had the position and the duties of parents. According to the modern notion the State is a club; the Government is the organ of the influences predominating in the body. . . . With us the State is neither a family nor a club: but it is on its path of transition from the former to the latter. . . . The public men of the present day are—I must not conceal it from myself—engaged in regulating and qualifying, and some of them in retarding, this transition. But the work proceeds; and as to that work regarded as a whole, and its results, I view them with great alarm.

'The State cannot be said now to have a conscience, at least not by me, inasmuch as I think it acts, and acts wilfully, and intends to go on acting, in such a way as no conscience—that is, no personal conscience (which is the only real form of one)—can endure. But the State still continues to act in many ways *as if* it had a conscience. The Christian figure of our institutions still remains, though marred by the most incongruous associations. There are, therefore, actual relations of the State to Religion—I mean to determinate religion—which still subsist and retain much vitality, and offer opportunities of good in proportion to it, however they may be surrounded with violent moral contradictions. For the sake of these opportunities I think that public life is tolerable, and in my case, as it at present stands, obligatory. But it is like serving for Leah afterwards to win Rachel.

'I have clung to the notion of a conscience, and a Catholic conscience, in the State, until that idea has become in the general mind so feeble as to be absolutely inappreciable in the movement of public affairs. I do not know whether there is one man opposing the Maynooth Bill upon that principle. When I have found myself the last man in the ship, I think that I am free to leave it.

'But some persons will say a principle is not to be regarded

¹ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, i. 179.

² Lathbury, *Correspondence*, i. 71.

as a ship which may be left in extreme necessity ; it is a witness for truth, and power and life belong to it as such. Then my answer is, I do not think that any theory of government is in this sense a principle. My language has always been, " Here is the genuine and proper theory of government as to religion ; hold it as long as you can, and as far as you can." Government must subsist ; and if not as (in strictness) it ought, then as it may.'

The influences which gave rise to Gladstone's book, and the profound effect which the demonstration of its practical futility wrought upon the progress of his mind, have been dealt with formerly in the pages of this Review.¹ When the preceding letter to Newman was written, the question to which it relates had become for the moment quite secondary ; and the thoughts of all men who were concerned for the future of the Church were turned anxiously upon Newman himself. His unsettlement had long been known ; his personality, and his position in the Movement, made the prospect of his secession, to men like Gladstone, one of calamity. Several months before it actually took place, he writes to Hope as follows (May 15, 1845) :

' I can well conceive a far more perfect system than that of the English Church as it is on paper—but even from that I am infinitely distant. And yet, if a man may rely upon inward and spiritual facts, of which we may have at least as sure knowledge as of sensible objects, I say with immovable conviction, we have in the Church of England, even amongst her mutilated institutions, large and free access to our Lord and a communion with Him sufficient to form in ourselves, as I have plainly seen it form in others, all the lineaments of His Divine Image, and how *can* things be right if, while we drink the blessed life-giving stream, we disown the channel that brings it, and suffer our hearts to wander, and our hands to be slack ?

' It may be that this fatal sentiment, which touches one and another as God permits, shall continue to spread, that our best hopes of realizing a Catholic system for ourselves and our children in this mourning Church shall one by one be smitten down ; that the elements of life will be withdrawn from us (as God has heretofore suffered other and greater Churches of less sinful men

¹ *C. Q. R.*, April 1904.

to be destroyed) by degrees, and more and more space cleared for the ravages of the heretical principle that abides among us ; and that as Rome has fearfully ripened the harvest of unbelief in the lands of her unchecked dominion, so she may prepare it here also by exhausting the Church of England of her life and power. Up to this time these accursed mischiefs can scarcely be said to have begun. Those who have gone are to be deplored indeed, on many grounds, but they were not the men who have led and formed the inmost mind of the Church of England in the generation passing by, nor the men that were to form it in the generation that is coming on. It will no longer be wholly thus, if God shall permit the calamity of Newman's abandonment of the Church to descend upon us. If that comes, which I do not yet regard as certain, what extent of evil will follow is an awful secret of the future ; I fear the worst from the Anticatholic reaction, fortified by such evidence as the history of the period from 1833 will have placed in its hands. But be that as it may, it will indeed be an appalling result if the fairest hopes that these three hundred years have yielded, not only for religion in England, but for the ultimate reunion of Christendom, shall finally be blighted by the agency of the very man who was the principal instrument employed in calling them into existence, and of those who call him their spiritual father. Nor will it be less mysterious and wonderful if the Church of Rome, which at this moment quakes in every country where it is dominant, in which the French Revolution ripened, and of which the actual Spain is a result, shall display among us a power for evil which she cannot evoke for good, and shall destroy us while she is engaged in a struggle of life and death, but not a triumphant struggle, with unbelief abroad. It is true our sphere is small, our strength is but weakness, our hopes are only in the bud, and yet they are such that it is no presumption, I think, to declare it proved by experience that they are beyond the reach of fatal harm from every *other* quarter.' ¹

It is a curious and significant fact—which the hapless arrangement of these volumes does its best to conceal—that at the very moment when Newman, at Littlemore, was expecting the visit of Father Dominic to receive him into the Roman Church, Mr. Gladstone, at Munich, was closeted with Dr. Döllinger, a new-found friend, and ever after one

¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence*, i. 340.

of the living pillars of his faith. On October 5, three days before Newman's secession, he writes to Mrs. Gladstone¹ of 'a most interesting conversation with Dr. Döllinger—I am to have yet one more evening with him, please God, to-night. I know that not even my saying so much about him will make you uneasy for me. But lest the thought should be suggested to you, let me tell you the effect of my conversations with him is confirmation and corroboration in our position as members of the Church of England, though it delights me to find so good and able a man in the Roman Church whose sentiments command so much my assent and sympathy.'

The event at Littlemore found Gladstone prepared and unshaken. He writes to Manning on the 20th:

'The conviction always returns upon me that, as the Church of England, being a reality, is not dependent upon this or that individual, the immediate duty is, when one secedes, simply to think of the supplying his place, as a rear-rank man steps forward when his front-rank man falls in battle. And what does England and its Church want? Certainly nothing of all that the ordinary powers and appliances of human nature can supply; nothing but the development of spiritual gifts, and of the Divine life within us. Have we men ready to devote themselves in mind and body and in all they have to the work of God? If not, it is all over with us—but if so, then every question that remains is subsidiary, and every difficulty surmountable.'²

The event has gone far to justify his own noble faith.

No man living felt more deeply the evils and embarrassments of the Church; yet his faith in it, his devotion to it, never wavered for an instant; and that for the mere reason that he believed it to be the Church. It is worth while accounting for his steadfast loyalty; for it is a fact of prime historic value. In the first place, his own confidence in its titles was original—a confidence fortified by independent, unremitting study and thought, and sustained by an inward spiritual experience as real and hardly tested as Newman's own. Moving forward by the light of an original faith, he

¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence*, ii. 264.

² *Ibid.* i. 349.

was not to be dispossessed of it by the doubts and falterings of any leader. 'I read Newman's letter with a heavy heart,' he writes to Manning in 1843 (October 24)—

'I had heard before of his difficulties and his failures in keeping some of his followers from lapse into Romanism. How can one wonder at either when his own foundations are apparently so undermined? . . . When I look at the words of his note, when I reflect that it is his pen which has traced the characters—"difficulties in defending her claims to be a branch of the Catholic Church"—when I recollect in what terms, with what force of arguments, for how many years of steadily ripening conviction, he has heretofore vindicated her titles—and review what *she* has been doing all the time while he has been making his transit to his present position—I do feel, not doubt as to her, but an utter shock to all confidence in the teaching of any man whose breath is in his nostrils. O that our feet may be set upon a rock and our goings ordered, and our vision made clear this way and that; for indeed I feel that there was truth in prognostications which I for one lightly regarded, and that storm and peril *have* arisen from the quarter where we looked for the guides to the haven of peace.' ¹

In the second place, Gladstone's Evangelical upbringing, the Presbyterian connexions of his family, and his own intimate concern with the ecclesiastical position in Scotland, led him to lay fast hold of what was simply essential; and to regard the fact of the Apostolic Succession, once established as pertaining to a Church, as closing all questions of personal allegiance,—so long at least as the Church, so accredited, maintained its witness to the Catholic Faith. That Newman's position could be seriously shaken by anything so slight and incidental as the opinion of the University authorities, or even individual Bishops or groups of Bishops, as to Tract XC, was a thing he simply could not understand. It affected his faith, not in the Church, but in Newman.

In the third place, he owed not a little, in the way of balance of mind, to his continual conversance with great affairs. It is in this direction that Gladstone's superiority to the professed ecclesiastics appears most marked. His

¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence*, i, 281.

constant effort is to bring to bear upon the issues agitated at Oxford the patient intelligence, the practised equitableness, of a high-minded man of the world, to prevent the needless exacerbation of issues, to stay precipitate or inadmissible proceedings, to exert a composing influence upon minds uncertain and tending to be distraught, to put forward the welfare of the Church as the ruling factor in all personal decisions. A disciple, not of Newman, but of Butler and Burke, he refused to view ideas apart from the conditions, the concrete human material, in which they were to be effectuated; the large destinies of men and Churches were not to be concluded in the lucubrations of the closet. He had small patience with the impatience of many to cut through tangles in the Church, when a man's whole lifetime had to be given, in the humbler sphere of civil polity, to the long laborious effort to unravel them. When, after the Gorham Judgement, his old and close friend Manning began to waver Romewards, he writes to him as follows (September 8, 1850):

'One only consideration led me to write as I did—the consideration, namely, of one point in the discipline life has given me, and one only, that can ever be of use to you. My life has, I know and feel, had this tendency, to lay a heavy weight upon the movement of the understanding when solicited to depart from the main practical principles by which it has been anchored, and to make the movements of all such processes exceeding slow. . . . Lagging behind you as, whenever I read your letters, I always feel myself to do, on this occasion for the first time it occurred to me, not because of the apparent interval between you and me, but between you and your former yet recent self, Can it be that, the shock of these awful times having driven him upon the problems that oppress other men, his trenchant intellect has found for him too sharp and short a way through them?'¹

The Gorham Judgement, which overwhelmed Manning, was literally the only cloud that ever cast a shadow over Gladstone's mind; but here his historical learning stood him in good stead; he knew enough of the origins of Anglicanism to have utter confidence in repudiating the

¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence*, i. 356.

Judicial Committee and its proceedings. But the attitude of many in authority was not equally decided ; he felt, as never before or after, that the Church of England was really upon its trial ; while he resolved, and very nobly executed the resolve, to leave nothing undone upon his own part to bring it happily through it. To Manning, at the critical hour, he writes (January 26, 1851) :

‘ You can do nothing that does not reach me, considering how long you have been a large part both of my actual life and of my hopes and reckonings. Should you do the act which I pray God with my whole soul you may not, it will not break, however it may impair or strain, the bonds between us. I should then earnestly pray, and not only to obey the promptings of my own heart, but to conform to a solemn conviction of duty, that you might not be as others who have gone before you, but might carry with you a larger heart and mind, able to raise and keep you above that slavery to a system, that exaggeration of its forms, that disposition to rivet every shackle tighter and to stretch every breach wider, which makes me mournfully feel that the men who have gone from the Church of England after being reared in and by her are far more keen, and I must add far more cruel, adversaries to her than were the mass of those whom they joined. In this I read their error, as well as in many other things.’¹

These letters abound in interest of many kinds. We have dealt with only one field of interest ; but it is, we think, the most fruitful of all. As a whole, these volumes bear out the impression of supreme consistency which was left by the study of Lord Morley’s *Life*. It is more than ever clear that the clue to Gladstone’s public action, whether it was the inspiration, the enigma, or the stumbling-block of his contemporaries, is to be found in following the line of his religious development. The Christian Faith and the Christian Church were the master theme of all his thoughts. For this reason the world, concerned to understand him, can hardly have too much of such material as these volumes contain. We only trust that in a further edition these letters, as they stand the mere *dissecta membra* of Gladstone’s mind, may

¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence*, i. 358.

be restored to the order in which, alive and full of meaning, they issued from it. If that is done, there will be nothing to subtract from the acknowledgements due to Mr. Lathbury for the labour and discrimination which has gone to placing them within our reach. These volumes are designed to fill a gap which the *Life* by Lord Morley expressly left void. We are bound to say that in our judgement they stand, for clarity of impression even in their own field, in no comparison with Lord Morley's work.

ART. II.—THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

1. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon.* Now first published from the Syriac Version by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Dubl.), Hon. LL.D. (Haverford), Hon. D.Theol. (Leiden), Hon. LL.D. (Birmingham), Hon. Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1909.)
2. *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert.* Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von JOHANNES FLEMMING, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von ADOLF HARNACK. 'Texte und Untersuchungen,' N.F. xxxv. 4. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1910.)

THE discovery of any addition to our somewhat scanty knowledge of the early history of Christianity must always be for theological students a matter of supreme interest, and we are indebted to Dr. Rendel Harris, who has done so much brilliant work in the past, for a particularly valuable contribution. If we may interpret his own account literally, the actual discovery was made on the shelves of his own library. Among some late paper-manuscripts in the Syriac language which came from the neighbourhood of the Tigris was one—imperfect at the beginning and end—which was found to contain a Syriac version of the 'Psalms of Solomon,' preceded by a second collection of writings which, there can be no reasonable

doubt, are the 'Odes of Solomon,' a work somewhat scantily mentioned in ancient literature. The two collections are, it may be mentioned, numbered continuously throughout: numbers one to forty-two forming the Odes, numbers forty-three to sixty the Psalms; the first two Odes and part of the third being missing, and the eighteenth and part of the seventeenth Psalms.

It is the contents of this manuscript that Dr. Harris has edited, and although we may differ from his judgement on several points, his edition is admirable. In particular there is a rhythmic beauty and distinction of style about his translations which give them the highest value both as representing the original and as literature. We need not pursue in detail the careful description of the manuscript and the investigation of the history of the work which Dr. Rendel Harris gives. It will be sufficient to mention the three or four points which are decisive as to the identification. In the *Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae*, ascribed to Athanasius but really dating from about the sixth century, and in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, the patriarch of Constantinople at the beginning of the ninth century—two lists of the books which formed, or claimed to form, a part of the Scripture—we find the Psalms and Odes of Solomon mentioned somewhat high up in the list of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and their combined length corresponds approximately to that of the newly found MS. This testimony is corroborated by quotations. Lactantius, writing at the beginning of the fourth century, quotes a passage as the work of Solomon,¹ and the manuscripts further state that the words occur in the nineteenth (or twentieth) Ode (or Psalm). The words quoted are actually found in the nineteenth Ode of the present collection. As Lactantius quotes in Latin, and as in other cases—such as the Sibylline verses—he quotes Greek books in Greek, it is suggested that he not only knew the work but knew it in a Latin translation. We are not

¹ He introduces it with the words, *Salomon ita dicit*. In the Epitome it is introduced by the words, *Apud Salomonem ita scriptum est*.

certain that this conclusion is quite sound. There might be reasons for not translating an 'oracle' which did not apply to an ode. But, at any rate, it is clear that Lactantius knew the work which has now been discovered, that he ascribed it to Solomon, and that either he or the copyists of his writings had the book before them with the odes arranged in the same order in which we now read them.

The second series of quotations are of particular interest. Students of Early Church history are well acquainted with a curious survival of Gnostic literature, preserved in the Sahidic dialect of the Coptic language and known as the *Pistis Sophia*. The book is extraordinary and bewildering in its contents, and, as Professor Harnack says, the first impression that it produces is that the writer 'appears to be busied with the propagation of systematic imbecility.' Dr. Rendel Harris suggests that he is not quite so foolish as he appears to be, or rather he has succeeded in discovering a method in his madness. But we are not so much concerned with him as with the important fact that he quotes portions of five of these Odes, that he introduces them with the words 'the power of Thy light prophesied in old time by the mouth of Solomon in his Odes,'¹ that he not only quotes them, but gives a long Gnostic targum or paraphrase and a detailed commentary, and that he treats them in just the same way as he does extracts from the Psalms and other books of Scripture. We have thus not only a second authority for the text of certain of the Odes, but are also helped by the character of the Coptic translation in restoring the Greek text in certain passages, and we have valuable testimony to the antiquity of the work.

The date of the *Pistis Sophia* is somewhat uncertain, but we may accept provisionally that assigned to it by Professor Harnack, who places it towards the end of the third century. It is hardly likely to be later, for, so far as we are aware, there was no living Gnosticism in the fourth century. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that this Gnostic writer looked upon the Odes of Solomon as Scripture.

¹ *Tua vis luminis ἐπροφήτευσε olim per Solomonem in eius ψαλμοῖς,*

We may conclude, then, that they were written not later than the second century—probably not later than the beginning of that century. They are not Gnostic in character, although lending themselves to a Gnostic interpretation, and they must have formed a part of the Canon of Scripture which this particular body of Gnostics took over from the Christian Church.

There is further reason for thinking that the work from which the author of *Pistis Sophia* quoted was one in which the Odes were preceded by the Psalms of Solomon and not, as in our Syriac manuscript, followed by them. The argument is the following: One of the Odes quoted in *Pistis Sophia* is said to be the nineteenth. Now, it is not the one called the nineteenth in our present collection, nor is it contained in it at all. But this collection, being mutilated at the beginning, does not contain the first two. The most natural explanation of these facts is that it was the first of the Odes, and was preceded in the manuscript used by the author of *Pistis Sophia* by the eighteen Psalms.

The result of this examination of the external evidence is to establish the fact that the newly discovered writings are the Odes of Solomon, and to suggest that they could not have been written much later than the beginning of the second century after Christ.

This addition to our knowledge of early literature is of particular interest. It has indeed no controversial value. It cannot be used to establish the date of any book of the New Testament: it provides no evidence on the history of Christian institutions, nor as to the origin of the Christian ministry. It is not unorthodox, but it cannot be used to support any orthodox doctrine. It represents religious experience and devotion, and not history, or controversy, or theology; and, as such, it is a work which with some defects is of high intrinsic value. It embodies the devotions of a pious, somewhat mystical, mind, who lives remote from the affairs of the world, who walks with God, who is carried away by the contemplation of the wonderful redemption which he

has experienced and records. As Dr. Harris says: 'The new Odes are marked by a vigour and exaltation of spiritual life, and a mystical insight, to which we can only find parallels in the most illuminated periods of the history of the Church.' 'Their radiance is no reflection from the illumination of other days: their inspiration is first-hand and immediate; it answers very well to the summary which Aristides made of the life of the early Christian Church when he described them as indeed "a new people with whom something Divine is mingled."' ¹

Now this adds to their interest and value, but it makes the work of a critic difficult; for internal evidence gives us little assistance as to their date and origin. They contain no history and but little technical theology. Dr. Harris points out the contrast with the Psalms of Solomon:

'The case of the Odes is very different. If there are any national disasters behind the songs, they have been lost in the songs. There is not a sad note, and there is hardly a vindictive note in the whole collection. And on the theological side, the leading characteristic is experience, and not dogma: and experience is much harder to date than dogma, and shows fewer of the weather-marks of evolution. Sometimes, indeed, the expressions of the Odists rise to such a height that they catch from the object of their Faith something that is everlasting rather than evolutionary. It is difficult to date a man who has disclosed the fact that he is supremely happy and that God has made his face to shine with the light of heaven. The only way in which we could date such a phenomenon would be to say that, if he is not an isolated specimen, the songs must proceed from some time of general spiritual elevation; and since it is historically verifiable, that the experimental time of the bloom of Church life is the first age (for one hardly expects to find people generally rejoicing with "an unspeakable and glorified joy," say, in the time of Constantine), then these hymns or odes must belong to the first days of the Church: but even that way of dating them is somewhat indefinite.' ²

Whoever wrote these Odes it is their intrinsic value—

¹ *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, pp. 1, 2.
Op. cit. p. 53.

high one—which is the most important point about them; but the investigation of their origin raises many questions of interest, and the discussion of these problems will probably be the best means of introducing new readers to the character and contents of these new-found apocrypha. Various suggestions have already been made. Dr. Rendel Harris, the first discoverer, considers them the work of a Jewish Christian writer dating perhaps from the first century. Professor Harnack looks upon the collection as of Jewish origin, but interpolated at an early period by a Christian writer. Dr. Emery Barnes thinks that some of the Odes are Montanist—a theory with which we need not trouble ourselves. Dr. Bernard, in an article of great brilliancy, contends that they are baptismal songs, and would place them not earlier than the middle of the second century.¹

We will begin with the examination of the theory of Professor Harnack :

‘As a matter of fact,’ he says, ‘the conclusion that these Odes are Jewish, and equally the other that they are Christian, both alike lead to such difficulties that they are untenable. I have, in every different way and with the help of the most varied hypotheses, long attempted to save the integrity of the Odes, to assume a Gnostic Jewish-Christian mystic for the author and in that way make their complex character explicable. But all these attempts have been in vain. So I have been compelled to adopt the hypothesis, that these Odes are like the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs a Jewish work, a Psalm-book of the time of Jesus, which has been taken over by the Christian congregations in Palestine and completely re-edited, somewhere about the year 100. Harris did not consider the possibility of this hypothesis; but he has definitely left the way open for it by urging the possibility of Jewish Odes. Experts are well aware that I do not easily allow myself to adopt a theory of interpolation.’²

He further adds that this conclusion is of the greatest interest. It is epoch-making for the higher criticism of St. John’s Gospel, since the Jewish Odes, and not only

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xii. Oct. 1910.

² Harnack, *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch*, pp. iii., iv.

the Christian additions, already contain all the distinctive elements of the Johannine theology with its peculiar religious tone.

It is obvious that this result of Professor Harnack's theory, while it would increase its importance, will certainly make us look upon it as in the highest degree improbable, and one that demands very cogent proof. It would certainly be a remarkable fact if we should find a Jewish writer, uninfluenced by the teaching of Jesus, using habitually such terms as 'grace' (χάρις), 'believe' (πιστεύειν), 'knowledge' (γνῶσις), 'truth' (ἀλήθεια), 'light' (φῶς), 'living water' (ῥόδωρ ζῶν), 'love' (ἀγάπη), 'life' (ζωή). An hypothesis which leads to such a conclusion demands careful investigation.

Now, it is pointed out as a leading characteristic how much there is absent from these Odes which we might expect. The name Jesus does not occur, His Cross and sufferings are not referred to or not directly mentioned, there is nothing about sin, repentance, baptism, forgiveness. There are, in fact, large elements of the Christian life entirely absent from the writer's horizon. We shall deal with this subject later. It must, however, be pointed out—and Professor Harnack does not conceal the fact—that the same is true of Jewish religious life. There is no reference to the ceremonial life, there is no reference to the Jewish law, there is no apocalyptic or eschatological element, there is in fact little or no contact with current Judaism. It might be suggested that there are certain types of religious experience which are singularly unaffected by the externals of religion, and that this has always been the case in all periods of Christian history. The negative evidence, in fact, is of little weight; for religious devotion—as in the case of the Old Testament Psalter—is very difficult to date.

But we must come to particulars. There are two Odes which in the opinion of Professor Harnack are definitely Jewish—the fourth and sixth. It will be as well to quote the sixth in full. It is as follows :

[] 'As the hand moves over the harp, and the strings speak, so

speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord, and I speak by His Love. For He destroys what is foreign, and everything that is bitter: for thus it was from the beginning and will be to the end, that nothing should be His adversary, and nothing should stand up against Him. The Lord has multiplied the knowledge of Himself, and is zealous that these things should be known, which by His grace have been given to us. And the praise of His name He gave us: our spirits praise His holy Spirit. For there went forth a stream and became a river great and broad; for it flooded and broke up everything and it brought [water] to the Temple: and the restrainers of the children of men were not able to restrain it, nor the arts of those whose business it is to restrain waters; for it spread over the face of the whole earth, and filled everything: and all the thirsty upon earth were given to drink of it; and thirst was relieved and quenched: for from the Most High the draught was given. Blessed then are the ministers of that draught who are entrusted with that water of His: they have assuaged the dry lips, and the will that had fainted they have raised up; and souls that were near departing they have caught back from death: and limbs that had fallen they straightened and set up; they gave strength for their feebleness and light to their eyes: for everyone knew them in the Lord, and they lived by the water of life for ever. Hallelujah.'

It is clear that the imagery of this Ode is based on the well-known description at the end of the Book of Ezekiel, of the river flowing forth from the Temple, and watering all the land to the eastward. Under this same imagery the writer describes a great stream of spiritual life which floods the whole earth, but flows not from the Temple but towards it. Now, Professor Harnack would argue that this passage shews that the Temple is still standing, and that the Jewish character of the work is proved by the fact that the stream of spiritual life flows over the Temple. But is this the way in which a Jew would write? Would he not certainly, like Ezekiel, represent the spiritual stream as flowing from the Temple? Moreover, to what event in the history of Judaism would this Ode refer? Where in Judaism was the stream of spiritual life which spread over the face of the whole earth so that

all the thirsty upon earth were given to drink from it? This is a universalism unknown to Judaism in its highest moments. To us as to Dr. Rendel Harris the passage reads as a description of the spread of Christianity—a Christianity which will ultimately embrace Judaism within its fold, even although priests and rabbis might fight against it. 'The writer,' says Dr. Harris, 'is exultant in his universalism; the stream of living water has gone out into all the earth: thirsty souls everywhere have been refreshed by it: dying souls have been revived. The writer is as universal as St. Paul.'¹ It is interesting to remember that a portion of this Ode was contained in the *Pistis Sophia*, and therefore it is not an entirely new document, and that Professor Harnack in a previous comment upon it stated that it was undoubtedly Christian. We must own that we prefer his earlier to his later opinion. There is one more point. Is it really necessary to hold that this passage implies that the Temple is still standing? The river is symbolical, and the restrainers of the waters are symbolical, and the thirst and weariness are spiritual. Is it not far more in accordance with the whole character of the Ode to consider that the Temple is used symbolically for Judaism, and that we have not here any historical allusion which can help us to find a date?²

The fourth Ode is more difficult, but we are not certain if it really helps Professor Harnack. We will quote it also:

'No man, O my God, changeth thy holy place; and it is

¹ Harris, *op. cit.* p. 96.

² In a paper in the *Expositor* (July 1910, pp. 57-59) Professor Emery Barnes of Cambridge, commenting on this Ode, suggests that in certain places the text is corrupt and would leave out all reference to the Temple. We note that he desires to find a Montanist author, and that therefore the mention of the Temple must be removed. But he seems to have forgotten that this is a passage contained in the Coptic, and that therefore we are not dependent only on the Syriac version for its correctness. There seems no doubt as to the reading in the Coptic. See also the same writer's review of Harnack in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1910, p. 617.

not (possible) that he should change it and put it in another place: because he hath no power over it: for thy sanctuary thou hast designed before thou didst make [other] places: that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself. Thou hast given thy heart, O Lord, to thy believers: never wilt thou fail, nor be without fruits: for one hour of thy Faith is more precious than all days and years. For who is there that shall put on thy grace, and be hurt? For thy seal is known: and thy creatures know it: and thy [heavenly] hosts possess it: and the elect archangels are clad with it. Thou hast given us thy fellowship: it was not that thou wast in need of us: but that we are in need of thee: distil thy dews upon us and open thy rich fountains that pour forth to us milk and honey: for there is no repentance with thee that thou shouldest repent of anything that thou hast promised: and the end was revealed before thee: for what thou gavest, thou gavest freely: so that thou mayest not draw them back and take them again: for all was revealed before thee as God, and ordered from the beginning before thee: and thou, O God, hast made all things. Hallelujah.'

The words at the beginning are obscure: if we may believe Dr. Barnes¹ they are corrupt. But taking them as we have them, do they really mean what Professor Harnack would have them mean? Do they imply that the Temple is still standing, and that the writer was a Jew? And is Dr. Rendel Harris' interpretation any better? He could find a reference to the Temple at Leontopolis.

'The reference to an unsuccessful attempt to alter the site of the Sanctuary of the Lord can only be explained by some unknown movement to carry on the Jewish worship outside the desolated and proscribed sanctuary, or by the closing of the Jewish temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, which was, perhaps, itself in the first instance built under the pressure of the situation which resulted in the desecration of the temple at Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes. As the latter explanation leans on fact, rather than on hypothesis, we may accept it provisionally as the real interpretation of our Psalm, which is thus dated

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1910, pp. 616, 617.

soon after A.D. 73 when the temple of Onias was closed and dismantled by the Romans.' ¹

But is all this necessary? Is not the language really symbolical as in the sixth Ode, and is not the meaning the same—'That which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself'? That which is younger is Christianity. Judaism will not be destroyed. It will take its place in Christianity. The references in both Odes do not refer to the Temple or the Sanctuary as actually standing, but as symbolizing the Israel after the flesh. The sentiment is not that of a Jewish-Christian in the technical sense of the term, but of a Jew who has become a Christian and believes that the new life which has been for him such a wonderful experience will embrace within its fold the Jewish race. His thought is like that of St. Paul when he said, 'So all Israel shall be saved.'

This interpretation harmonizes with the whole character of the Odes; throughout we are dealing not with historical allusions but with spiritual experience, and it is well illustrated by Professor Nairne.

'There are passages, indeed, where Dr. Harris has possibly clipped the poet's wings himself in another fashion. Surely the historical allusion he finds in Ode 4 to "an unsuccessful attempt to alter the site of the Sanctuary of the Lord," is out of place. The "holy place" here is the same as "the Temple" in 6, "Paradise" in 11, "the Lord's land" in 15, "the dwelling-place of the Word" in 12, and perhaps the "river" in 26. It is, in the same wide poetic sense as elsewhere, what we may more dogmatically style "the Church." And the warning, "No man, O my God, changeth Thy holy place . . . that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself," expresses a thought which appears again and again in these Odes—that there is but one Church, as there is but one Messiah ²; the Jewish Church of old, and the Christian Church of the new day are one, always of "another race" from the yet ungathered world ³: "unpolluted" by the admission of the

¹ Rendel Harris, *op. cit.* p. 91.

² Ode 41.

³ Ode 41.

Gentiles¹; continuous, in spite of the claims of new teachers to find independent ways of joy and grace.'^{2 3}

These two Odes are the only ones which in Professor Harnack's opinion shew unmistakeably signs of a Jewish origin. They do not seem to us a strong basis on which to build up his theory.

Let us take next an illustration of 'interpolation.' In the following transcript of the seventh Ode we have put in italics all the passages which Professor Harnack considers to be the work of a Christian interpolator:

'As the impulse of anger against evil, so is the impulse of joy over what is lovely, and brings in of its fruits without restraint: my joy is the Lord and my impulse is toward Him: this is my excellent path: for I have a helper, the Lord. He hath caused me to know Himself, without grudging, by His simplicity: *the greatness of His kindness hath humbled me. He became like me, in order that I might receive Him: He was reckoned like myself in order that I might put Him on; and I trembled not when I saw Him: because He is my salvation: like my nature He became that I might learn Him and like my form, that I might not turn back from Him;* the Father of knowledge is the word of knowledge: He who created wisdom is wiser than His works: and He who created me when yet I was not knew what I should do when I came into being: wherefore He pitied me in His abundant grace: and granted me to ask from Him and to receive from His sacrifice: because He it is that is incorrupt, the fullness of the ages and the Father of them.

'He hath given Him to be seen of them that are His, in order that they may recognize Him that made them: and that they might not suppose that they came of themselves: for He hath appointed to knowledge its way, He hath widened it and extended it; and brought it to all perfection; and set over it the traces of His light, and it goeth from the beginning even to the end. For by Him it was wrought, and it was resting in the Son, and for its salvation He will take hold of everything: and the Most High shall be known in His Saints, to announce to those that have songs of the coming of the Lord; that they may go forth to meet Him, and may sing to Him with joy and with the harp of

¹ Ode 10.

² Ode 23.

³ *The Guardian*, June 3, 1910, p. 778.

many tones : the seers shall come before Him and they shall be seen before Him, and they shall praise the Lord for His love : because He is near and beholdeth, and hatred shall be taken from the earth, and along with jealousy it shall be drowned : for ignorance hath been destroyed, because the knowledge of the Lord hath arrived. They who make songs shall sing the grace of the Lord Most High ; and they shall bring their songs, and their heart shall be like the day : and like the excellent beauty of the Lord their pleasant song : and there shall neither be anything that breathes without knowledge, nor any that is dumb : for He hath given a mouth to His creation, to open the voice of the mouth towards Him, to praise Him : confess ye His power, and show forth His grace. Hallelujah.'

Now, it may be admitted at once that the passages that are said to be interpolations are Christian ; but do they really differ in tone and character from the rest of the Odes ? The Ode as a whole has a meaning : it describes in the characteristic language of the writer the Incarnation and the joy of the saints.

'The incarnate Messiah is still the maker and sustainer of all things, in whom all things consist. The knowledge of this revelation produces praise and expectation, praise for those who sing His advent, expectation for those who look for His triumphant rule among men. All evil is to pass away and all hate. The saints who sing are already exulting in the new life which He has bestowed upon them.'¹

All that makes a coherent Psalm. But take away the supposed interpolations and the motive of the song is destroyed.

Again, what is the meaning of 'His sacrifice' ? To a Christian the words are quite intelligible. But on Professor Harnack's interpretation they become, as he himself says, meaningless, and have to be emended. To a Jew, what evidence was there of the spread of divine knowledge ? What Coming of the Lord has filled him with joy ? Where are the signs of the destruction of hatred and ignorance on the earth ? To us the whole Psalm harmonizes with a

¹ Rendel Harris, *op. cit.* p. 99.

Christian environment, but does not find a place in the Jewish life when the nation was rushing to its destruction, or at a time after Jerusalem had fallen.

And this is true, we believe, of almost all the Odes. There are a considerable number which have no specific Christian allusions: that is, in which there is no word or phrase which we can call necessarily Christian. But yet it is almost impossible to imagine them to be the work of a Jew. For what circumstances in the history of the Jew, shortly before or after the Christian era, would inspire such poetry as this? Whence could come this consciousness of a new acquisition of a divine knowledge, of the gift of God's Holy Spirit, of hope, and life and immortality? All these represented the central convictions of the followers of Christ, but where do we find them with the same serenity of joy in Judaism? Take, for example, the fifteenth Ode, where Professor Harnack finds no need for the interpolator:

'As the sun is the joy to them that seek for its daybreak, so is my joy the Lord; because He is my Sun and His rays have lifted me up; and His light hath dispelled all darkness from my face. In Him I have acquired eyes and have seen His holy day: ears have become mine and I have heard His truth. The thought of knowledge hath been mine, and I have been delighted by means of it. The way of error I have left, and have walked towards Him and have received salvation from Him, without grudging. And according to His bounty He hath given to me, and according to His excellent beauty He hath made me. I have put on incorruption through His name: and have put off corruption by His grace. Death hath been destroyed before my face: and Sheol hath been abolished by my word: and there hath gone up deathless life in the Lord's land, and it hath been made known to His faithful ones, and hath been given without stint to all those that trust in Him. Hallelujah.'

What would this mean for a Jew? It implies some change which has come to the writer. 'His light hath dispelled all darkness from my face.' 'In Him I have acquired eyes.' 'The way of error I have left.' 'I have put on incorruption through His name,'—all language natural

to one who has learnt Christianity, but hardly to a Jew. And what Jew could say, 'I have seen His Holy day'? The writer is like Simeon in the Temple: he can now depart in peace because he has seen God's salvation; but what Jew could ever say that he had seen it? We would ask our readers to study also the eleventh Ode, which again is one where the presence of the interpolator is not suspected.

We are now in a position, we believe, to dismiss Professor Harnack's hypothesis, and may attempt to construct a theory of our own.

Let us ask first—Are all the Odes the work of one writer? We think that the first impression of anyone reading them would be that they are. There is an individuality about them, an originality of style and expression, which separates them as a collection from any other writing that we know. And this impression will be strengthened by the careful study of Dr. Rendel Harris. He shews that the same imagery, the same somewhat bizarre expressions connect together large groups of these Odes. He weakens his argument in our opinion by not having the courage to carry it to its logical conclusion. There are a few Odes which are distinguished by a rather crude theology which conflicts both with his taste and with the very early date that he would ascribe to the collection. This is especially the case with Ode 19. 'The doubtful member, in my judgment, is Ode 19, which is far too grotesque to be by the same hand as the other compositions. It appears to me to be an imitation of the other Psalms that speak of the breasts of God. It is tritheistic as well as grotesque.'¹ But the fact remains that the imagery is identical with that in two others. The same is the case with Ode 42, which again on dogmatic grounds Dr. Harris would put later, but the opening resembles Ode 37 and still more Ode 27. The fact is, that when we occasionally get imagery and symbolism which is somewhat grotesque, we have the defect of the author's qualities. We may call him Oriental in his style, or a visionary, or a mystic. The

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 52.

point is that, while generally the impression made upon us is pleasing, occasionally the symbolism becomes crude and fanciful. And this seems particularly the case when the writer passes from religious experience to theology. The theology is for the most part not good, it is extravagant. All attempts at expressing the mysteries of the Christian religion in human language must be inadequate, and some of the most inadequate would naturally arise in the early days of the Church when there was no tradition to help. We may see this by a comparison with Ignatius. Take, for example, Ignatius' language on the Trinity :

' Forasmuch as ye are stones of a temple, which were prepared beforehand for a building of God the Father, being hoisted up to the heights through the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the Cross, and using for a rope the Holy Spirit ; while your faith is your windlass, and love is the way that leadeth up to God.' ¹

Compare with that the following extract from Ode 19 which offends Dr. Harris so much :

' A cup of milk was offered to me : and I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord. The Son is the cup, and He who was milked is the Father : and the Holy Spirit milked Him : because His breasts were full, and it was necessary for Him that His milk should be sufficiently released ; and the Holy Spirit opened His bosom and mingled the milk from the two breasts of the Father.'

Both these metaphors offend the taste ; both occur in writings where there is much deep religious experience and true poetic expression, and we do not see any reason for finding another author for the four or five Odes where we do not admire the style. We are certain also that such theological language is just as likely, if not more likely, to occur at a very early period, in the history of the Church as at a later period, when a more appropriate terminology was beginning to be conventional.

We see no reason, then, for thinking it necessary to find a plurality of authors in these Odes, and our criticism

¹ Ign. *ad Eph.* 9.

will be on the supposition that we cannot evade difficulties by suggesting interpolations by another hand.

Now there are, we believe, two broad facts to be remembered. The first is that the writer is putting what he has to say in the mouth of Solomon. In doing that he was conforming to a literary custom of the last centuries of Judaism. A severe critic might speak of it as the great age of literary forgery. But forgery is not the right word. The writer believed that he was interpreting correctly the traditions of the Jewish race, and the method that he took to impress on his readers the truth and importance of what he said was to put his words in the mouth of one of the great men of the past. To write in his own name might seem to have been personal self-assertion. At any rate, whatever may have been his motive, he did just what many other people of his time did. He had probably read the Psalms of Solomon, and he follows the example of the writer of that collection in using the name of Solomon. The Old Testament gave him an opening, for it stated that Solomon's 'Songs were a thousand and five.' He is, therefore, putting his religious experiences in the mouth of an Old Testament writer. Now, for one acting thus there were certain conventionalities to be observed. The Apocryphal writings abound in anachronisms, it is true, but there are certain obvious ones which must be avoided. Their history is continued indeed up to the time of the date of writing, but it is always put in the form of symbolical prophecies. Names are avoided. The Book of Daniel to the scholar abounds in anachronisms, but there is no open reference to the times when it was written. Once remember that these Odes are supposed to be the work of Solomon, and we can understand why a good deal of obvious Christian phraseology is avoided. It was quite natural that Solomon should speak of 'the Son,' or 'the Word,' or 'the Lord,' or 'the Messiah,' for all these are natural Old Testament expressions; but to use the name 'Jesus' would have been contrary to all the conventions. It might indeed have been concealed under some strange number, but that was all. He can

say: 'I stretched out my hands and approached my Lord: for the stretching of my hands is His sign: my expansion is the outspread tree which was set up on the way of the Righteous One.' But he would not speak openly of the Cross. 'The Dove fluttered over the Messiah because He was her head; and she sang over Him and her voice was heard,' was a right way of referring to the baptism of our Lord. It is obvious that the corporate side of the Christian life does not appeal to the writer: it is his own personal salvation and redemption that he is concerned with; but any reference he might make to the Eucharist or Baptism or the Church would not be expressed in ecclesiastical language, but would be veiled under symbolism.

A second point to notice is that the writer is not one who quotes. If we study the writings of the post-Apostolic period, there is an extraordinary difference as to the extent to which the different writers quote both the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Epistle of Polycarp is a cento of extracts from the New Testament. The writer has very few ideas or phrases of his own. Ignatius quotes very little. Hermas hardly at all. Now it is important to notice this, for there has been a curious tendency among critics to argue that if an author who is represented for us by a short work has not quoted a book, he does not know of it, and this even though there may be indirect allusions. Now, our author does not quote. We can see this, if we study his relation to the Old Testament. On any hypothesis he was well acquainted with that. He knew the Psalms well, he was impressed by them, he constantly uses words and phrases and ideas which come from them; but we doubt if there is a single definite quotation. Take, for example, Ode 14:

'As the eyes of a son to his father, so are my eyes, O Lord, at all times towards thee. For with thee are my consolations and my delight. Turn not away thy mercies from me, O Lord: and take not thy kindness from me. Stretch out to me, O Lord, at all times thy right hand: and be my guide even unto the end, according to thy good pleasure. Let me be well-pleasing

before thee, because of thy glory and because of thy name : Let me be preserved from evil, and let thy meekness, O Lord, abide with me, and the fruits of thy love. Teach me the Psalms of thy truth, that I may bring forth fruit in thee : and open to me the harp of thy Holy Spirit, that with all its notes I may praise thee, O Lord. And according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, so thou shalt give to me ; and hasten to grant our petitions ; and thou art able for all our needs. Hallelujah.'

In this, as Dr. Rendel Harris says, 'the canonical Psalter is somewhat more closely imitated than is generally the case with our collection.'¹ Yet, while there are many echoes, there are no quotations. We think of the words : 'As the eyes of a maid to the hand of her mistress' ; 'He will be our guide unto death' ; 'Teach me, O Lord, the way of Thy statutes,' and so on ; but not even here—and it is the Psalm in which we should have expected it most—does the writer quote. Again, it is particularly important to notice this in relation to the use of the New Testament. We have many reminiscences of language, but no quotations, and this especially in relation to the Johannine writings. Now this has been used as an argument in favour of a Johannine Christianity before St. John, or even (as by Harnack) of a Johannine Judaism. All these theories are forced and unnecessary. No doubt the writer of the Fourth Gospel did not invent all his phraseology. A good deal, in fact, was already Christian. A certain amount came from Jewish sources. But when a number of different tendencies unite together in creating a distinctive style, we may take it that it is generally the work of one mind. After all, there are some people in the world who make a start, and we require very much more evidence than that of a number of doubtful guesses to adopt so unnecessary an hypothesis as that this creative genius was someone else and not the author of the Fourth Gospel. The writer of the Odes of Solomon knew St. John as he knew the Psalms. And he is influenced by them in the same way. There are no quotations, but there are

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 108.

many echoes of the subject-matter and many words with a definite religious signification derived from it.

'I should not have known how to love the Lord, if He had not loved me.'¹ 'He that is joined to Him that is immortal, will also himself become immortal; and he who is accepted in the Living One, will become living.'² 'Living water.'³ 'A stream . . . spread over the face of the whole earth, and filled everything: and all the thirsty upon earth were given to drink of it; and thirst was relieved and quenched.'⁴ 'He became like me, in order that I might receive Him.'⁵ 'The mouth of the Lord is the true Word, and the door of His light.'⁶ 'The dwelling-place of the Word is man: and its truth is Love.'⁷ 'The Son of the Most High appeared in the perfection of His Father; and light dawned from the Word that was before-time in Him.'⁸ 'His Word is with us in all our way.'⁹ 'I went up to the light of truth as if into a chariot: and the Truth took me and led me . . . I did not make an error in anything because I obeyed the Truth.'¹⁰

Now we readily admit that no single passage above can be called a quotation, but we also believe that not one of them could have been written unless the Fourth Gospel had been written and had been known to the writer.

We must now turn for one moment to the interesting article by Dr. Bernard, already referred to. Dr. Bernard's view is that—

'Whether the Odes were originally composed for use in public worship, or were, at the first, private meditations on the spiritual life, the idea at the heart of them seems to be the joy and the privilege of the new-made Christian; and this appears in so many forms that it is possible that they are nothing more or less than *Hymns of the Baptized*. At any rate, the thought of baptism gives the clue to the interpretation of many passages, some of which have as yet received no explanation from the editors.'

He then proceeds to give various parallels to baptismal

¹ Ode 3.² Ode 3.³ Ode 6.⁴ Ode 6.⁵ Ode 7.⁶ Ode 12.⁷ Ode 12.⁸ Ode 41.⁹ Ode 41.¹⁰ Ode 38.

language and ideas. The expression 'the illuminated,' the 'white robes' or 'robes of white,' 'the garment of incorruption,' 'the garlands' of the newly baptized, 'living water,' 'the seal,' the bringing forth of fruit, 'Paradise,' 'milk and honey,' the triumph over the dragon, the sealed letter, all these are dwelt on at length and illustrated from prayers and hymns used at a later date in Baptism. Allusions are also found to the baptismal ritual, the stretching out of the arms, the breaking of the Easter morn, unction, the delivery of the Gospel, the procession with torches.

Now we may admit at once that Baptism filled a great place in the thought of the second and third centuries. The symbolism of the *Shepherd* of Hermas and the beautiful language of Cyprian are excellent testimonies for the two centuries. We may admit again that probably the impressive and elaborate ritualism of Baptism was developed earlier than we have direct evidence for it. Further, it is true that much of the imagery and symbolism which we have in the Odes is similar to language used later of Baptism, and we may go so far as to admit that it may have been Baptism that in some cases has suggested it. But if we turn from Dr. Bernard's paper back to the Odes, we shall be convinced, we believe, that the writer of them is thinking primarily of the new life he is experiencing and not of Baptism. No doubt he had been baptized. No doubt Baptism may have provided language to express his own spiritual experiences, but it is not of Baptism that he is thinking. Further, in some cases the reference to Baptism is forced, and unreal. It would be far truer to say that language which is here as elsewhere used of the Christian Life as a whole was quite naturally introduced into baptismal services and songs, and so obtained a specialized use. The particular development of his theory on which Dr. Bernard insists is probably more than doubtful. But his article has strengthened the evidence for looking upon these Odes as being wholly Christian and as being written not earlier than the second century.

We have now examined all the various questions that have been raised and are prepared to state our conclusions.

We see no reason for doubting that all the Odes are the work of one hand, we see no signs of interpolation, and we believe that the author was a Christian. These Odes are the work of a Jew who had become a Christian, who was perhaps a native of Egypt, and who lived early in the second century. The only reason for ascribing the work to Egypt is that it is there they are first known of, and the floods and the reference to the restrainers of the waters might be suggested by the inundation of the Nile. The reason for ascribing it to the early second century is that the theological point of view exactly corresponds to that transitional period. On the one hand the writer knew the Fourth Gospel, on the other he writes before any technical theological terms have become stereotyped. In his reference to the Trinity, to the Virgin Birth, and to the descent into Hell he writes just as a man of that date might. The conception of the Trinity is formulating itself, and we have hyperbolical analogies similar to what we find in Ignatius. With the curious language about the Virgin Birth compare what the same writer says: 'And hidden from the prince of this world were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing and likewise also the death of the Lord—three mysteries of shouting—the which were wrought in the silence of God.'¹ Let us remember also that the Legends of the Infancy, in some form at any rate, and the great mass of the Apocryphal writings, date from the second century, and early in it. As indeed was natural, for it was when the teaching of Christianity was new and before it had been formulated by philosophy, that fancy could find opportunity for a free indulgence in its dreams and visions.

There is one more doctrine conspicuously taught—the descent into Hades:

'Sheol saw me and was made miserable: death cast me up and many along with me, . . . and I made a congregation of living men amongst his dead men, and I spake with them by living lips. . . . and those who had died ran towards me: and

¹ Ign. *ad Eph.* 19.

they cried and said, Son of God, have pity on us, and do with us according to thy kindness, and bring us out from the bonds of darkness: and open to us the door by which we shall come out to thee.' ¹

This teaching was well developed in the second century, as it was essential teaching for any loyal Jew, because it shewed him how the patriarchs were benefited by the death of Christ.

Anyone who reads through Dr. Rendel Harris' notes will see what difficulties he is involved in by trying to find too early a date for these Odes. There is not a word in the whole collection which could not have been written by a Christian and in the second century. The style and character is homogeneous, any theory of interpolation and of duality of authorship will lead to constant difficulty. An early second-century authorship will meet all the conditions, internal and external, required, and we would suggest it to our readers as the best probable hypothesis.

And now we may free ourselves from criticism and discussion and turn briefly in conclusion to the great fundamental thoughts of the writer. He is not a theologian or a philosopher or an historian: he is a devout man with spiritual insight and a deeply religious mind who is describing a wonderful experience which has happened to him, a new life, a new joy, a new hope, a new salvation:

'I was crowned by my God: my crown is living: and I was justified in my Lord: my incorruptible salvation is He . . . I received the face and the fashion of a new person . . . and the thought of truth led me on. And I walked after it and did not wander: and all that have seen me were amazed: and I was regarded by them as a strange person: and He who knew and brought me up is the Most High in all His perfection. And He glorified me by His kindness, and raised my thought to the height of His truth.' ²

This new life has come to him as to all men who received it because the Most High has revealed His knowledge to the world, and because He has become like us in His

¹ Ode 42.

² Ode 17.

Incarnation. The revelation of His knowledge is described in an Ode which abounds in the fanciful symbolism which is the defect of the writer's literary qualities. But though the details are obscure the meaning is quite clear. A letter has come down from Heaven, the thought of the Most High has been revealed, it has advanced through the world like a great wheel, it has crossed the rivers and rooted up the forests and made a broad path. It comes from the head, even the Son of Truth, it is 'a great volume written by the finger of God: and the name of the Father was on it, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to rule for ever and ever.'¹

But it is not only a revelation, it is an incarnation.

'The Lord hath caused me to know Himself, without grudging, by His simplicity: the greatness of His kindness hath humbled me. He became like me, in order that I might receive Him: He was reckoned like myself in order that I might put Him on: and I trembled not when I saw Him: because He is my salvation: like my nature He became that I might learn Him and like my form, that I might not turn back from Him.'²

No wonder that the saints go forth to meet Him with joy, and the seers shall praise Him, and that they who sing songs shall sing the grace of the Lord Most High. He has given a mouth to His creation. Nothing that breathes shall be without knowledge or dumb.

The new life thus revealed by the Incarnation of the Son of God is a life of Union with God, of Union in the love of God.

'I love the Beloved, and my soul loves Him . . . I have been mingled with Him, because I shall find love to the Beloved . . . I shall love Him that is the Son, that I may be a Son . . . for he that is joined to Him that is immortal, will also himself become immortal.'³ So 'the Lord is on my head like a crown.'⁴ 'I was crowned by my God: my crown is living.'⁵

His happiness makes him so free from fear of trouble

¹ Ode 23.

² Ode 3.

⁴ Ode 1.

Ode 7.

⁵ Ode 17.

and¹ persecution as almost to ignore it. Very seldom does he refer to earthly troubles and fears.

It is a life also in the Spirit:

'As the hand moves over the harp, and the strings speak, so speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord, and I speak by His love.'¹ 'The Most High clave my heart by His Holy Spirit.'² 'As the wings of doves over their nestlings . . . so also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart.'³

And so there is a strong intellectual background to the new life; it comes from the revelation of the knowledge and truth of God. 'I went up to the light of truth as if into a chariot: and the Truth took me and led me . . . it became to me an instrument of Salvation: and set me on the arms of immortal life: and it went with me and made me rest, and suffered me not to wander, because it was the Truth.'⁴ He is established upon the rock of truth: 'like the flow of waters flows truth from my mouth.'⁵ 'I am a priest of the Lord, and to Him I do priestly service: and to Him I offer the sacrifice of His thought.'⁶ Was there ever a more beautiful description of the Christian service, offering to God our spirit which has been transformed by Him?

It has been pointed out that the note of Penitence is not frequent. It is the glory and the danger of the mystic that he has passed beyond the thought of sin and the need of forgiveness to the beatific life of Union with God, a union which he has grasped at while still living this earthly life. But once we get the note in an image of great beauty:

'Behold! the Lord is our mirror: open the eyes and see them in Him: and learn the manner of your face: and tell forth praises to His spirit: and wipe off the filth from your face: and love His holiness, and clothe yourselves therewith: and be without stain at all times before Him.'⁷

It is no wonder that with such an experience as he has had, the life of the Christian is full of joy. The night is

¹ Ode 6.² Ode 11.³ Ode 28.⁴ Ode 38.⁵ Ode 12.⁶ Ode 20.⁷ Ode 13.

passed, the Sun is risen. 'He is my Sun and His rays have lifted me up. . . . Death hath been destroyed, . . . there hath gone up deathless life in the Lord's land.'¹ The spiritual experience in this life is the surety and sign of the life which is eternal.

'The Lord renewed me in His raiment, and possessed me by His light, and from above He gave me rest in incorruption. . . . He carried me to His Paradise; where is the abundance of the pleasure of the Lord; and I worshipped the Lord on account of His glory. . . . There is abundant room in thy Paradise, and nothing is useless therein. . . . glory be to thee, O God, the delight of Paradise for ever.'²

The recovery of the thought and aspirations of early Christianity has at times given us less pleasing aspects of the first days, and reminded us that there were men of that day with the same passions and the same littleness as ourselves; sometimes it has provided food for our ecclesiastical trife. But here we have in this long-forgotten voice from the dead a wonderful portrayal of the loftiest motives that won souls to Christ when the Gospel was a new message, when it flashed into the world as a revelation of truth and love and joy, when it came as a spiritual refuge to all who sought the Lord, when it corresponded to all that was loftiest in human aspiration, when it gave an assurance and hope of the glorious life in eternity with the Most High through the blessedness of the spiritual union with Him on earth.

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM.

¹ Ode 15.

² Ode 11.

ART. III.—DEMOCRACY IN ENGLISH FICTION.

The Vicar of Wakefield. By OLIVER GOLDSMITH. (London. 1766.)

Bleak House. By CHARLES DICKENS. (London. 1853.)

The Old Wives' Tale. By ARNOLD BENNETT. (London: Chapman and Hall. 1908.)

Thompson's Progress. By CUTCLIFFE HYNE. (London: T. Nelson and Sons. 1910.)

And other Works.

HOWEVER we may despise fiction, there is no doubt that it often unconsciously fulfils purposes which no other form of writing, except perhaps diaries and familiar letters, can pretend to fulfil. It gives us the atmosphere of an age or a generation, and it clothes the dry bones of history with flesh and blood. We shall find, as might be expected, that just in proportion as the lower classes—we use the term in no invidious sense—rise in importance, so do works of fiction concern themselves with their doings. In the days of Homer, while the adventures and exploits of kings and chiefs were chronicled with abundance of loving and admiring detail, the common herd were almost passed over in silence.¹ So tales of chivalry, the delight of the Middle Ages, dealt mainly with the doings of noble knights and beautiful ladies. Chaucer and *Piers Plowman* reflect in their poems the change that was coming over English thought and life. The characters, largely drawn from the middle classes, who appear in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, herald a new era in English literature. But in the *Tales* themselves the serious element is chiefly supplied by the 'privileged classes,' while the lower orders are mainly employed to give comic relief. The old ballad

¹ The delightful episodes of Eumæus and Euryclea, both in the *Odyssey*, might be quoted as exceptions; but the poet's main interest is in their relations with Odysseus.

Chevy Chase puts into the mouth of perhaps its bravest warrior the characteristic words :

‘ You be two earls, quoth Witherington,
And I a squire alone.’

Even Shakespeare does not, as a rule, concern himself much with the doings of the baser sort. He has a great contempt for the masses, as we may see in the opening scene of *Julius Caesar*, and, like Chaucer, he generally utilizes them to supply the comic element in his plays. But there is at least one notable exception. The finest scene in *Henry V* is without doubt the one where the king, unrecognized in the early morning twilight before the battle of Agincourt, takes part in the dialogue between ‘ Bates, Court and Williams,’ three English soldiers, on the probable fortunes of the day. Here Shakespeare shews a genuine sympathy with the point of view of the common soldier, and the reality which this gives to the situation adds to the impressiveness of the magnificent soliloquy which follows :

‘ Upon the king !’

This, however, is almost a solitary instance, for the beautiful figure of ‘ Adam’ in *As You Like It*—a part which tradition tells us, and which we love to believe, was once performed by the poet himself—shews us one whose chief characteristic is that of fidelity to his superiors. It is in this character, and not merely on his own account, that he interests us.

Long indeed after Shakespeare’s time the main interest of English fiction, as well as of the drama, continued to be with the upper classes. ‘ Every reader ’ (says Goldsmith in the *Vicar of Wakefield*), ‘ however beggarly himself, is fond of high-lived dialogues, with anecdotes of Lords, Ladies and Knights of the Garter.’ This delightful romance poses, nevertheless, none of its charm from the circumstance that it deals with the fortunes of simple and humble folk ; and Fielding’s novels also shew that the public taste was shifting, and that ‘ low life ’ had begun to have an interest

of its own. 'Except what Dr. Burdock does' (says Lady Blarney in the *Vicar of Wakefield*) 'and our dear countess at Hanover Square there's nothing comes out but the most lowest stuff in nature, not a bit of high life among them.' This was written about 1765. Fielding had died in 1749, but his popularity was very high when Goldsmith wrote, and the art of Hogarth, though chiefly concerned with the vices and follies of the rich, was as broad in its sympathies as it doubtless was in its humour. It was long, however, before literature seriously occupied itself with the fortunes of the very poor. Some of the most exquisite lines of Gray's *Elegy* shew a fine and real sympathy with the 'rude forefathers of the hamlet,' though we may venture to doubt if the shy sensitive inmate of Peterhouse would have had very much to say to one of the rustics of Stoke Poges if he had found himself in his company. Shenstone's delightful *Schoolmistress* and Goldsmith's *Deserted Village* somewhat idealize the rustic life. Perhaps the first writer who ventured to paint the English poor as they really are was Crabbe. Such lines as the following make one wonder that he and Robert Burns could have existed in the same century and in the same kingdom:

'Reuben and Rachel, though as fond as doves,
 Were yet discreet and cautious in their loves;
 Nor would attend to Cupid's wild commands
 Till cool reflection bade them join their hands.
 When both were poor, they thought it argued ill
 Of hasty love to make them poorer still;
 Year after year, with savings long laid by,
 They bought the future dwelling's full supply;
 Her frugal fancy cull'd the smaller ware,
 The weightier purchase asked her Reuben's care!
 Together then their last year's gain they threw,
 And lo! an auction'd bed with curtains neat and new!

What if, when Rachel gave her hand, 'twas one
 Embrowned by winter's ice and summer's sun?
 What if in Reuben's hair the female eye
 Usurping grey among the black could spy?

What if, in both, life's bloomy flush was lost,
And their full autumn felt the mellowing frost?
Yet Time, who blowed the rose of youth away,
Had left the vigorous stem without decay.'¹

If Crabbe was one of the most prosaic of poets, there is no doubt that his great admirer Walter Scott was one of the most poetical of prose writers; and it is remarkable that a man of his aristocratic tastes and old-world proclivities should have been inimitable in his representation of humble and middle-class life. He is far more 'convincing' in his portraits of David and Jeanie Deans than is—to our mind at least—in the somewhat conventional figures of his tales of chivalry who, while placed in the twelfth century, converse in quasi-Elizabethan English. We have only to mention his *great* novels—the *Antiquary*, *Waverley*, *Mantering*, the *Bride of Lammermoor*, etc., to remind ourselves of scenes in which he shews a sympathy, quite unpatronizing, with the peasant, the fisherman, the gipsy, the beggar, the Liddesdale yeoman and the Highlander. One feels that he has lived with the people, eaten and drunk and talked with them, and all this without the slightest sacrifice of delicacy or refinement.

We cannot, especially with Mr. Barnes' delightful Dorsetshire in our mind, exactly say of the English peasantry, *parent vate sacro*. But we fear it must be owned that they are less susceptible of poetical handling than their northern neighbours. The English peasant of the Midlands and the South finds scarcely a place in the pages of Jane Austen. We feel little doubt that one of so kindly a nature, especially in her character of clergyman's daughter, was 'good to the poor.' But hardly ever in her pages is a poor man or woman sympathetically painted. The North of England fared better. Much of Wordsworth's genius was devoted to the presentation of the poetical side of humble life, and of those emotions which are shared by 'the general heart of men,' as illustrated in the lives of Cumbrian shepherds and other simple folk. Mrs. Gaskell's

¹ *Parish Register*.

Mary Barton, with its vivid photographs of Manchester workmen and workwomen, may be said to have been an 'epoch-making' book. And the greatest of English woman writers, George Eliot, chose for the hero of her most perfect work (the exquisite tale of *Silas Marner*) a Derbyshire weaver; while in her other great novels, the novels in which she is most truly herself, we find a gallery—second only to Scott's, and drawn as it would seem from Lincolnshire, Derbyshire, Notts, and Warwickshire—of men and women of nearly every class, whose enthusiasm has been aroused by the great Wesleyan and Evangelical movement—that one redeeming feature, apart from the great European struggle, in the crass dullness of eighteenth century life.

So far, however, be the theme what it may, we find the pen always in the hands of the 'privileged' or 'educated' classes. Men and women write about the poor, but they are not really of them.

With the advent of Dickens the new school of modern fiction may be said to begin. Dickens was a man of the people, and wrote for the people. Born and reared in poverty, scrappily and imperfectly educated (though it is extraordinary how his brilliant ability turned to account the few opportunities he had), trained in the hard school of adversity, and in very many departments of that school, he had seen more of life before he was thirty than many men do in double or treble the time. On the publication of *Pickwick* he may be said to have 'awakened and found himself famous.' In every circle of society his books were read, discussed, laughed over, cried over, wondered at, and doubtless criticized. We can hardly doubt that some great social reforms were indirectly promoted by them. 'Mr. Pecksniff,' 'Mrs. Gamp,' and 'Dotheboys Hall' have become part of the English language. People protested at the 'vulgarity' of Dickens, but they bought and read. They might have said with truth that it was not the vulgarity as such which attracted them, but the exuberant, bubbling humour which played around it, and the wholesome, kindly and, at bottom, religious nature of the

writer. No one could ever say that Dickens had a coarse mind. Even when describing the foulest and most loathsome situations, we never feel that *he* is foul or loathsome. His sympathies are always on the right side. Like Dante's Vergil, he takes us down to some hideous circles of the inferno, but he is himself unstained by their impurities. There is something Hogarthian in the touches of human tenderness with which he relieves some of his darkest pictures—such as the faithful dog-like devotion of the woman to Bill Sikes, despite all his selfishness and cruelty, or the element of motherly affection in the heart of Lady Dedlock. It is worth notice how, even when Dickens is caricaturing the upper classes in the person of Sir Leicester Dedlock, his sense of fairness shews itself. Sir Leicester is a true gentleman through it all; courteous in his stiff way towards 'the iron-master,' and beautifully chivalrous to his erring wife. As Dickens' career continues, we see his tone distinctly rising, his earnestness deepening, his views of life expanding, and his workmanship becoming more refined; while in common with his brilliant contemporaries, Thackeray and Trollope, and indeed with most of our Early Victorian novelists, his writings might be enjoyed by readers of both sexes, and practically of all ages. In *Vanity Fair*, for instance, Thackeray has to follow the career of Becky Sharp; but where a writer of a younger generation would probably have handled the episode of Lord Steyne in an offensive, if not unreadable way, Thackeray contrives to tell the story without appealing to our coarser impulses. There is a dignity and self-restraint, a culture, a wit and refinement about his methods, which, alas, seems not always to have descended to our present school of writers. How differently, for instance, would a story like that of *Ruth*, so delicately and sympathetically handled by Mrs. Gaskell, have been treated by some of the lady (?) novelists of the present day! It is indeed a painful sign of the times that many of the writers of our most regrettable works of fiction should be women. Owing to causes which cannot be discussed at present, it seems as if delicacy in treatment of moral

problems always went hand in hand with reverence for sacred things. Anyone who looks back to the great novelists in the latter half of the nineteenth century will feel how high their standard was in these respects. A religious sense is never obtruded by any of the three great writers whom we have mentioned, but it would be easy to point to passages in all of them in support of this statement, such as—clerical satirist as he undoubtedly was—some really beautiful passages in Trollope's *Orley Farm* and the *Small House at Allington*, while parts of his novel of *Dr. Thorne* might with little alteration be republished as a most powerful tract in aid of the temperance cause. No thoroughly earnest and unbiased writer who views human life, its cares, its frustrated or fulfilled ambitions, its loves and its hatreds, its false displays and its true glories as they really are, can fail to become somewhat of a preacher, nor can fail to feel a deeper reverence, as life goes on, for the Being who made us and guides our destinies, and to whom we are morally accountable for our actions.

Since the days when Dickens and Thackeray flourished, what enormous new fields have been opened to the novelist! We have a whole library of books, mainly tales, about India, both of Anglo-Indian and of native life. Other writers deal with South Africa and Australia, and 'the magnetic North' is not unrepresented. We have pictures of life in the 'slums,' in Whitechapel and Poplar, in our great manufacturing towns, and in lonely country places. The charm of Italy is not absent; Russia contributes her share; we have sketches of Jewish life, of university life, of artist life; in fact, there is hardly any field, including that of religious controversy, into which the novelist has not penetrated.

Taking the literature of fiction during the last twenty years as a whole, what shall we find its characteristics to be? One cannot deny its cleverness, in some instances its originality and freshness, its vivid power of word-painting, its frankness, carried sometimes to the point of impropriety, and its ease, accompanied very often by bad vulgar English and slipshod grammar. It is curious how our old favourite

Punch seems to reflect the character of the moment. Since the days of Du Maurier the women of that delightful periodical, though not without attraction, seem to have all suddenly become middle-class. We miss those elegant 'society' women, for whom even Mr. Ruskin had a word of admiration.¹ The high-bred element seems gone, and with it we often miss the careful drawing and the eye for real beauty which not unfrequently made Du Maurier's backgrounds and other accessories things of delight in themselves. The vulgarity of children's illustrated books is another regrettable feature of our day.

Of *Punch* we may boast, and rightly boast, that he is very, very rarely either coarse, disgusting, or profane. Unfortunately this cannot be said of much of our modern literature. It is difficult, from the very nature of the subject, to give illustrations of these matters, but anyone who is familiar with modern English fiction must feel the regrettable influence of Zola and other French writers upon their neighbours on this side of the Channel. There seems to be an idea in the minds of many literary men and women that if you only describe commonplace things with sufficient realism you have produced an original work. We admire Mr. Arnold Bennett's brilliant abilities, and some of his productions, so much that we cannot but regret that he should ever have brought himself to publish such a book as *The Old Wives' Tale*. Much in the opening chapters is purely ugly and disgusting, such as the incident of the girl pulling out the tooth of the draper's assistant. It is really not funny, and it dwells on things which no one has any pleasure in reading or thinking about; while the later portion of the book, the heroine's life in Paris, is full of suggestions of indelicacy and coarseness. Mr. Bennett is by no means alone in this respect. The names of some of his most distinguished contemporaries will

¹ Some of us may remember a professorial lecture of Mr. Ruskin's at Oxford when he descanted on the elegance of the head of 'Mrs. Ponsonby de Tomkyns' (an enlarged copy of which was shewn) when she promises Lady Midas to 'throw over the Botherby Jones, and come herself.'

easily suggest themselves. We are far from saying that novelists can always avoid dealing with matters of this kind, but the only way to make such subjects tolerable is to interest us very deeply in the characters in whom a moral struggle is portrayed (such a character, for instance, as that of Maggie Tulliver in *The Mill on the Floss*). But character painting is the rarest of rare arts, and is not possessed by one novelist in ten; and it certainly is conspicuous by its absence in a great deal of modern work. Given a novelist who has not a single fine character in his repertory (and apparently there are such), whose sense of humour is not over-delicate, and who has no lofty ideals to the attainment of which his personages may strive—what is left him? No doubt the passion of love, physical gratification of all kinds, the acquisition of wealth, or escape from danger. Consequently we find 'love' described in the most realistic and often most offensive way; heroines who are supposed to be beautiful but who have practically 'no characters at all,' or at least no characteristics except that one is a blonde and looks well in blue, another a brunette and looks well in red, and who attract their lovers purely and simply by physical charm. Writers of this type, who reflect what presumably is ordinary middle-class life, depress us very much by the tameness and pettiness of their ideas. Is it because life is so dull that they are dull, or because they do not read the inner secret of many homely lives? We are inclined to think it is the latter; that even in Camberwell or Kennington we may still, if we know how to look for them, find genuine heroes and heroines.¹ Most of us have heard of, perhaps have seen, the 'dowser,' who with a willow or hazel twig is able to divine where water is likely to be found. But it is not every man or woman who can be a 'dowser.' It is not everyone, not even among clever people, who possesses the divining rod of sympathy. We all see what we *are*, and find what we are on the look-out for. If we cast our

¹ Mr. Pett Ridge's charming little book, *Mrs. Galer's Business*, and Mr. Whiteing's *No. 5, John Street*, may be mentioned in this connexion.

eyes back on the last dozen novels (if modern ones) we have read, shall we not be obliged regretfully to say that in the majority of them—for of course there are exceptions to all rules, and among the exceptions we should like gratefully to specify some of the novels of Mr. Anthony Hope—we do not care in the very least what becomes of any of the characters? We are not sufficiently convinced of their existence. They never speak to us heart to heart. They may constitute, as in novels of the 'sword and cloak' order, the human thread which runs through a tissue of strange adventures, or, in novels of another class, the links between a series of absurd and humorous scenes; they may become vehicles for sensation in one writer's hands, or mouthpieces for sermons or political and economic views in another; they may, under a thin veil of fiction, reproduce one man's travelling experiences, or another's historical researches; but what, we may ask, do any of these things profit, if the characters are little better than dressed-up dummies, or, if human beings at all, human only in a low, coarse, and commonplace way, or, worse than all, only the actors in a hideous murder trial?

There lies before us, as we write, a clever readable novel—*Thompson's Progress*, by Mr. Cutcliffe Hyne, the history of a self-made man who begins as a poacher and ends as a prospective peer. It is a book not only entertaining but instructive; the hero is a shrewd long-headed Yorkshireman, and the story of his progress is most entertainingly and at times humorously told. He has a series of delightful dogs. He meets with one adventure after another and always 'comes out top,' he is not without kindness, public spirit and good nature, and his attachment to the wife whom he eventually wins is a strange compound of love and ambition. One would not describe him exactly as a 'worldly' character, but he is certainly a man whose own 'cuteness and power of getting on almost stand in the way of his higher development. He would probably not have agreed with Mrs. Browning—

'What 's the best thing in the World?
Something out of it, I think.'

We follow his career with breathless interest, but we put the book down with a sense of disappointment. Is this all, we feel inclined to say, all that this cleverness and energy leads to? And as we put down the book, we feel as if we could take up and read for the twentieth time Thackeray's death of Colonel Newcome, the man whose death was the close of a series of failures and disappointments, but whom no one can read of without loving, and whom a great writer's genius has made as real to us as a member of our own family circle.

There is a certain snobbishness about a good many modern novels, which is curiously characteristic of democracy. Dukes and duchesses, earls and countesses, Lady Bettys and Lady Gwendolens, are to be met there in profusion far greater than in real life. There are also young male scions of the aristocracy whose name and rank it is difficult to ascertain, as they are generally spoken of as 'Bob,' or 'Jim,' or possibly as 'Lord Billy' or 'Lord Dickie.' The duchesses are usually absurd and grotesque old women. Diamond tiaras and 'ropes of pearls' are as common as daisy chains, and everyone has a motor car (probably several) and an opera box. In no class of books are flunkeys and menials spoken of more contemptuously, though probably many of the readers of the work will belong to that class. It is a comfort to meet with a French maid, Pauline or Justine, as then we know pretty well where to look for the villain of the piece. If she has a slight tendency to a moustache on her upper lip, we may be quite sure of it. We feel a little regret that even so distinguished and cultivated a writer as Mrs. Humphry Ward has not been able to resist the fascination of the Peerage. But it is a comfort to think that when the party actually in power has done its worst, there will still be an Elysium left for members of that much envied and much persecuted order in the pages of contemporary fiction.

We have, however, another and more serious complaint to make against those novelists who, whether accurately or inaccurately—it is not for us to say—profess to depict

the 'smart set,' but who do so with an eye to readers of the lower middle class; and this is the extreme irreverence and profanity which deform their pages. In this respect, we think, they surpass their French contemporaries, though they can hardly do so as regards indelicacy and immorality. But the very fact that the Bible is the most familiar book in the English language, and that its 'felicities' of expression fix it easily in the memory, makes it possible for writers who have very little knowledge of other kinds of literature—in which it may be remarked by the way that they are much inferior to the great writers of the last generation—to quote it on every occasion, and often most irreverently as well as tastelessly. This is one of the cheapest and most offensive forms of wit, and we cannot but regret to see it employed by men and women whose very familiarity with Scripture is due to the education they have received. It would be easy to give quotations from the novels of the last twenty-five years, where some of the most sacred and awful things—the Divine Name, the Passion, the Day of Judgement, and many other subjects which reverent natures would speak of only at suitable times and in lowered tones, are introduced in the midst of the most frivolous surroundings. It is possible that in some cases these sacred associations have ceased to have any meaning for the writers to whom we refer; but, even should this be the case, may we not ask them to remember that there is even now a large portion of the reading public which still feels reverence for sacred words and sacred things, and which is deeply pained when it sees them treated with flippant profanity? It seems almost unnecessary to say that, were we to judge from a large portion of modern literature, family prayers were *always* dull and unreal, the 'local curate' an easy and obvious butt for raillery, and the bishop, archdeacon, or other dignified clergyman a pompous self-satisfied nonentity, that Sunday in high life was almost invariably devoted to playing bridge, and that sermons were always synonymous with boredom. There may be a residuum of truth in all this; but as in real life we sometimes do find bishops and clergy who have their

Master's cause at heart, and are not seeking themselves, or are even full of the dignity and importance of their own order, while even among the laity there are still a few good men and women left whose religious earnestness makes itself felt in every day and hour of their lives, might it not be possible to let us catch, if it were, but occasional glimpses of them?

'Young man, tell me your dreams,' was the question once put by a celebrated artist to a youthful aspirant for fame. 'Tell me your dreams?' is the question which might be put to the readers of modern fiction. What is the *Telos* at which all these struggling, striving multitudes are aiming? When we look at the frieze of the Parthenon, and ask ourselves whither the stream of youthful horsemen and graceful maidens is moving, we are told that it is to do a great act of homage to the tutelary goddess of their city. The purpose, as they understood it, is a noble one, and noble are the figures which carry it out. But what strikes one in the majority of our modern works of fiction is a total lack of nobility. After all, what constitutes nobility? Surely it is having a noble aim. It might be said, and very likely may have been said already, that we can judge of a man or a nation by the heaven to which they aspire. What is the heaven to which our modern fiction in the person of its heroes and heroines seems to aspire? Ten thousand a year, luxuries and display, a title and the *entr  e* into 'fashionable' society!

It may very truly be said that poetical justice cannot depict for us the unearthly joys which are the crown of a good man's life, and therefore the artist has to fall back on temporal rewards, and that even Job had such material blessings bestowed on him. But (as in the case of Job) the true painter of human life has to shew us that these temporal blessings are not, and can never be, the real reward of fidelity to high aims, but only, at best, the tokens of it. The real reward must always be (as Sophocles shewed us long ago) the purification and elevation of the man's or woman's own character, and the bringing them closer to those ultimate realities which lie behind the phenomenal world.

This can be done, and has been done, by great writers of fiction. But perhaps it may be said that writers cannot all be great, and yet that they may help to beguile a dull or sorrowful hour. We admit it most readily: we have had far too much reason to be grateful to writers of fiction to think of doing otherwise. But taking this objection on its own ground, may we not truly say that there is no humour so delightful, no fun so light-hearted, as that which belongs to the pure in heart? Even the humour of Aristophanes, and still more that of Shakespeare, is not delightful *because* of its coarseness, but in *spite* of its coarseness. Take the *Midsummer Night's Dream*: it seems to have been written in a complete 'abandon' of light-heartedness; and yet it is doubtless the one of Shakespeare's plays in which there is hardly a licentious word. Coarseness (at all events in modern writers) is usually a confession of weakness and of an empty exchequer, an indication of intellectual barrenness; and the same may be said of profanity. The finer the talent, the less need it has to eke out its resources by means like these. May we not say with truth that it is one of the dangers of the democracy to which we seem to be tending, that these finer perceptions will be blunted, and that our art and our literature are already beginning to shew indications of the fact? No word has been more unfairly employed than the word 'aesthetic.' There is a false *aisthesis* of which our decadent artists may be called the apostles, and there is a true *aisthesis* of which we have happily in the past had some notable instances in our English literature; it is that delicacy of feeling, as sensitive as the antennae of an insect, which we sometimes call good taste, but for which it is hard to find an adequate name, which has found its abode in many an English home, and which makes the man or the woman who possesses it a gentleman or lady in the truest sense of the word, quite irrespectively of wealth, talent, or social rank. We trust that our national fiction may never cease to depict such characters as these.

ART. IV.—THE 'POLICRATICUS' OF JOHN OF SALISBURY.

Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive de Nugis Curialium et Vestigiis Philosophorum Libri VIII.
 Recognovit et prolegomenis, apparatu critico, commentario, indicibus instruxit CLEMENS C. I. WEBB, A.M., Collegii Beatae Mariae Magdalenae apud Oxonienses Socius. (Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MCMIX.)

THE appearance of a new edition of the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury may serve as the occasion of putting before readers of the *Church Quarterly Review* some account of the principal work of a great Englishman, 'the central figure of English learning' in his time, as Bishop Stubbs has called him. Though the principal, the *Policraticus* is not in itself the most interesting of its author's writings. It has not the importance for the history of European culture of its sequel the *Metalogicon*, whence we may learn what were the methods and results of the philosophical teaching from the point of view of the most eminent representative of the short-lived humanistic movement, whose nursery was the school beside the cathedral church of Chartres of which John, who had studied there as a boy, was to die as the bishop. Nor has it the historical interest of the fragmentary *Historia Pontificalis* in which the hand of a contemporary especially well informed, endowed with a remarkably even-balanced judgement of men and things, master of an admirably simple Latin style, has painted for us the state of ecclesiastical politics at the time of the second crusade, the venality of the papal court, the moral laxity of high society in the crusading settlements in Syria and Palestine, the matrimonial disorders due to the combination of an unreasonably long list of prohibited degrees with a system under which numerous marriages within those degrees were let stand until it was for somebody's interest to get them annulled, and, in sharp relief against these dark shadows, the simple and straightforward goodness of the Pope Eugenius III, the friend and

pupil of St. Bernard. There too are drawn, with a wonderfully delicate discrimination and sincere appreciation of the merits of two great men, the contrasted personalities of St. Bernard himself, with his keen scent for heresy in theological speculation and somewhat unscrupulous fashion of prosecuting the chase of it, and of Gilbert de la Porrée, the philosophical bishop of Poitiers, whose study of his famous predecessor St. Hilary had led him into unfamiliar thoughts concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. John had personally known them both, and in later days did what he could to effect their reconciliation, but without success; he remained, however, loyal to both, and felt assured that 'now,' as he says, (for both were dead when he wrote this), 'they are agreed and gaze together upon the Truth which they desired.' Again, not to speak of the elegiac poem *Entheticus de Dogmate Philosophorum*, with its satirical account under symbolical names of the most prominent figures in English politics during the reign of Stephen, a book which still awaits a competent editor, one might well prefer to the *Policraticus* John's correspondence. The letters which he wrote as secretary to Theobald give us a vivid impression of the varied business of the archiepiscopal court of Canterbury at that time; they are, however, mostly impersonal and official. But the 'real letters,' as Bishop Stubbs calls them, which he wrote in his own person later in life during the exile of his friend St. Thomas of Canterbury, are charmingly written, thoroughly alive, and full of information for those who would understand their author's world. Yet, after all, it is in the *Policraticus* that we have the fullest expression of John's mind, with its universal curiosity, steady commonsense, wide and discriminating scholarship, strong moral convictions, genuine piety, and a lively English patriotism for which there remained no distinction of Norman and Anglo-Saxon, and which included a wholesome pride in the local traditions of Salisbury and Wiltshire, his native town and county; a patriotism, however, united with that profound attachment to the interests of the larger civilization of Christendom, which was the ground of his uncompromising adherence in the dispute between Henry II and Becket to the cause of the latter,

far from blind though he was to the Archbishop's faults of temper and judgement. We see John here as above all else a humanist, possessed of a conception of the world of classical antiquity very limited, no doubt, in comparison with that of the scholars of the Renaissance, yet the same in kind as theirs, and singularly free from the fantastic distortion and false perspective so common among mediaeval writers, especially after the literary scholarship of the twelfth century had given way to the tyranny of the scholastic philosophy, when the Latin poets whom John knew so familiarly were almost forgotten in the preoccupation of the most thoughtful minds of the age with the speculative problems suggested by the physical and metaphysical treatises of Aristotle.

The *Policraticus* opens with a short dedicatory poem in which, following the example of Horace and Ovid, John addresses his book and bids it seek out the person to whom it is inscribed, Thomas the Chancellor (afterwards the murdered Archbishop), who was then with Henry II at the siege of Toulouse in 1159, and whose excellences are described in a somewhat hyperbolical strain; it is then to cross the Channel and take the road to Canterbury, where (it was hinted) it had been before and in great part written; here, no doubt in the library of the Cathedral monastery, to find a lasting home. What is in all probability the presentation copy of the work to Thomas has been made the basis of the text in the new edition. The identification of a twelfth-century MS. left to Corpus Christi College at Cambridge by Archbishop Parker as this very copy is due to the present Provost of King's, who found in it the press marks corresponding to those assigned in a fourteenth-century catalogue of the library of Christ Church, Canterbury, to that then included among the books of St. Thomas there preserved. As we read these introductory verses we have called up before us the picture of the traveller approaching the metropolitical city from the coast and catching sight afar off of the famous golden angel who, from his lofty station on the tower of the great Church, 'surveyed the world, foretold the weather, calmed the sea, and sleeplessly protected

from all evil those upon whom he looked down'; and in whom John recognized no less an angel than the Angel of the Great Counsel Himself, with a prayer to whom that He may enlighten with His Spirit the minds of all who fear the Lord, the prose preface which follows the introductory verses is soon to end. This preface is occupied with the praise of letters; and glances at a critic whom the writer does not name, though he threatens to do so unless he mends his ways, but whom in the meanwhile he is content to call Lanvinus after the 'old poet' against whom the prologues of Terence are directed and Cornificius after the detractor of Vergil. Cornificius and his hostility to the culture which John prized so highly reappear in the *Metalogicon*, but his true name still remains unrevealed.

The *Policraticus* has a second title, 'de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum'—'concerning the trifling pursuits of courtiers and the traditions of the philosophers.' The first five books are devoted to the former and the last four to the latter subject. The first form of courtly idleness which John castigates is the chase, and, though care must be taken here and elsewhere in disentangling what belongs to his own time from the mass of miscellaneous tradition in which it is embedded, there is a genuine sincerity, however conventional and traditional his language, in his denunciation of the mighty hunters of his day, who neglected their families and their estates for their sport, and of the cruel rigour of the forest laws, whereby the death of wild animals was revenged by the infliction of exquisite tortures on men. 'They have not feared to destroy for a beast's sake a man whom the Only Begotten Son of God has redeemed with His own blood.' He touches but lightly and without mentioning names, lest he should chafe the wounds of those who were still mourning their kinsmen, on the deaths of princes in the chase. From hunting he passes to gaming. Here he tells a story of the sage Chilon refusing to conclude a treaty with the Corinthians because he found the magistrates at dice, which Chaucer borrowed from John (with a slip in the name of the hero) in his 'Pardoner's Tale,' and which John seems, according to a marginal note in

certain early MSS., to have taken with other tales from an otherwise unknown collector of such, named Catulus of Parma. Next to gaming comes music, and here we find him in sympathy with the Cistercian movement against an over-elaborate church music and commending the rule of 'a venerable man, the father of about seven hundred nuns,' no doubt his elder contemporary and countryman St. Gilbert of Sempringham, who forbade the sisters of his order (the only purely English religious order of the Middle Ages) to sing anything but plain-song. The actor and the conjuror of every sort next come under the lash, and the first book (which is a good illustration of the mediaeval puritanism familiar enough to students of the time, though ignored by such writers as Mr. Chesterton) ends with a grand display of the author's learning in the form of an enumeration of omens with illustrations from classical literature. He shews by his bantering tone that he does not take them seriously. It is said to be unlucky, he tells us, to meet a hare, especially if it runs away from you ; and indeed, says John, a hare is more useful on the table than on the road.

The beginning of the second book finds him still occupied with omens, but in a more serious vein. The believer in omens and dreams is never free from care. Physical causes of sneezes and the like are to be sought rather than prophetic, meanings and medical remedies for disease rather than magical. It is true that saints have wrought cures by the use of holy things and signs ; thus Cuthbert, a standard-bearer of our nation in the law of the Lord, healed sick folk by laying on them the book of St. John's Gospel ; such actions are lawful, for they proceed from faith in God and are referred to His glory ; but, these apart, we should lay aside with contempt all trust in occult indications of the future, relying on the text that 'all things work together for good to them that love God,' and leaving it to unbelievers to be, by God's permission, the sport of such delusions. For omens are effective just so far as they are believed in. Hence Julius Caesar's neglect of them is approved, and the story of his taking in a favourable sense

his ominous stumble on landing in Africa is paralleled by one of St. Mark, who, when his shoe-string broke as he landed at Alexandria, gave thanks thereupon that he had come to his journey's end. But while omens are but vanity, there are trustworthy natural indications of the future not to be confounded with such idle prognostics; of this sort are the appearances in sun or moon, or the behaviour of birds and other animals, from which we may foretell changes in the weather. Some of these genuine signs are of universal, some of particular import. Instances of the latter are the portents which preceded the fall of Jerusalem, Josephus' account of which is transcribed at length from Rufinus' version of Eusebius, to which, by a natural transition of thought, are added those reported by Suetonius to have heralded the accession of Vespasian to the imperial authority. Signs of general or universal import are such as those which preceded the death of Christ and the 'fifteen signs' that, according to a current tradition—which has, however, as John notes, no foundation in canonical scripture—are to announce the approach of the Day of Judgement. Such signs are against nature, if by nature we mean the wonted course of things; not if (with Plato) we identify nature with God's will, for miracles are not causeless, but have secret causes; thus at Cana the long processes by which in the course of nature water becomes wine were compressed by divine power into a moment, we know not how. This view of the evangelical story is derived from St. Augustine. John dwells at some length on one special kind of sign—the prophetic dream. Following a fivefold division of dreams (which he found in Macrobius) he tells us that two of these, the *insomnium* (such as Dido's dreams about Aeneas) and the *phantasma* (such as the nightmare), are without signification; two are plainly significant, the *somnium* (such as the younger Scipio's, when a mere boy, of the destruction of Carthage—John says by a slip Numantia—or that by which certain Roman citizens are said to have learned, at the time of Christ's birth, of the mystery of the Incarnation) and the *oraculum*, in which the information comes from the mouth of some venerable personage who

appears to the dreamer ; such as we read of in the *Aeneid*, or as the angelical warnings to St. Joseph and the Magi, St. Peter's dream at Joppa, and Constantine's of the Apostles Peter and Paul. The fifth, the *visio*, when the sleeper sees openly or (more often) under the figure of something else, what will hereafter come to pass, is at least figuratively significant. Of the former sort was Alexander's vision of his own death at the hands of Cassander, seen before he ever saw his future murderer ; of the second that of Julius Caesar, when, as Lucan tells us, ' his quaking country's mighty form ' warned him, while still on the further bank of the Rubicon, against the guilt of civil war. The representation of Rome by a woman of more than human stature John illustrates by the legend (found also in the ' Golden Legend ' and the old pilgrim's guide-book called *Mirabilia Romae*) of the image which the sculptor said ' would last until a virgin brought forth a child,' and which fell accordingly when Christ was born. But though we have in the accounts of significant dreams certain characteristics which may help us in the interpretation of them, John denies the existence of any genuine art of dream interpretation, and that those who, like Joseph and Daniel, were specially endowed with the gift of interpreting dreams, used any such. The apocryphal book which circulated as the *Conjectorium* of Daniel must thus be rejected. Art implies the use of reason, and there can be no art when reason is at a loss. Dreams are sent by spirits good or evil. That of which St. Augustine tells wherein a learned man dreamed that he instructed another in a difficult point, and the same night the other dreamed that he was so instructed ; or that in which St. Jerome was, by his own account, scourged for being ' no Christian but a Ciceronian,' were sent by good spirits. The experiences of the ' witches' sabbath,' in which persons weak in understanding and in Christian faith think they have ridden after the queen of night and seen her court, and witnessed the stealing of children by her attendants, some to be devoured, others to be replaced in their cradles, are but dreams sent by spirits of a contrary nature. More dangerous because less easily

cured than those fancies are the errors of the *Mathematici*, who follow the evil 'mathēsis' (which John distinguished from the good 'mathēsis' by lengthening the penultimate syllable) which, though based on the good, that is on genuine mathematical science, and following it in its study of the heavenly bodies, goes beyond it into a forbidden region by using the knowledge so gained as a means of prying into the future. The extreme point of their impiety is reached in their idolatrous doctrine that there might be fashioned by astrological rules the image of a man who might then be animated by the power of the stars and consulted as an oracle. A less reprehensible form of astrology does not ascribe divine power to the stars, but supposes that their motions are so ordered by the Creator that in them His determinations concerning the future can be read by those who have the skill. But 'poison lurks under the honey' even of this more plausible doctrine. Under the pretence of honouring God it excludes the freedom of the will and claims to know secrets which, by the express statement of the Son of God, the Father has kept in His own power. John is thus led on to deal with the famous question of free will and necessity. He argues that God's foreknowledge of the future imposes no more necessity on what is foreknown than does ours. God has an immutable knowledge of mutable things, as our minds have a non-spatial knowledge of spatial things. There is mutability in the objects of divine knowledge, but not in that knowledge itself; and Scripture has many instances of conditional foreknowledge, and even of conditional predestination. His discussion of further difficulties is acute and learned, but in the space here at our command could not be properly pursued. Where there seems an alternative between denying God's omniscience or contradicting an accepted philosophical principle, he would rather be thought illogical than heretical; yet he does not wish to contradict the accepted principle, and prefers to take refuge with Cicero in academic doubt. Speaking of Cicero, he describes him (taking the thought from Quintilian) as the glory of Latin literature who, by himself, can be compared or even

preferred to all that 'insolent Greece' can boast. The phrase caught the attention of Ben Jonson, who twice copied it, once in his praise of Shakespeare in *Underwoods*, once in his praise of Bacon in his *Discoveries*. In this 'transference to Bacon of a crown which he had made for Shakespeare' (as one writer—whom we quote from memory—has put it), some have seen a proof of his discovery in the interval that the true author of the plays called Shakespeare's was no other than Bacon. But, as we see, the crown was not made either for Shakespeare or for Bacon, nor was Ben Jonson himself the maker: it was made by John of Salisbury for Cicero more than four hundred years earlier.

Before leaving the puzzles about necessity and contingency, John refers to a charlatan named Lewis, whom he met in Apulia, where he lingered in uncomfortable exile 'in order to carry back with him into the Gauls the bones of Virgil' (presumably for magical purposes) 'rather than' (what John would consider far more precious) 'his meaning.' This 'modern Stoic,' as John calls him, with reference to the 'paradoxes' in which the ancient Stoics delighted, had offered Thomas a great sum of gold if he would prove he *could* do what he was not, as a matter of fact, going to do by actually doing it. Such puzzles, says John, which rest on a disregard of the logical rules of opposition, do not really disprove the knowledge by God or man of things which yet are not necessary but contingent. Astrology then is for John a way of damnation, and every kind of divination falls also under his censure. The wickedness and folly of seeking information from wizards or their familiars is illustrated not only by the story of the witch of Endor and other scriptural and classical stories, but by a piece of contemporary history. Two years before Becket had accompanied King Henry on his expedition against the Snowdon Welsh, and had, it seems, consulted a sooth-sayer as to the event; the answer had, one may judge (though John, writing to one who knew the facts, leaves much untold), been encouraging, but the campaign ended in disaster, nay, in a few days, unwarned by any, the English

host had lost one who was, as it were, its 'morning star.' This perhaps refers to the death in this expedition of Henry, son of Henry I by his mistress the Welsh princess Nest, grandmother of the historian Giraldus Cambrensis. The occasional correctness of the predictions given by sooth-sayers does not disprove the wickedness of consulting them ; for it shews not the hand of God but the long experience of the evil spirits, who also sometimes express their own fears, as when the heathen gods foretold the end of idolatry, while sometimes, like the spirit of divination in the Acts of the Apostles, they speak under compulsion. John tells an interesting and characteristic story of his own childhood. A certain priest to whom he was sent to learn his Psalter indulged in the not even now extinct practice of consulting the magic crystal by means of an innocent child.

'It happened that he made me and a boy somewhat bigger than I, after some wicked preliminaries, to sit at his feet and attend to the sacrilegious business of mirror-witchcraft, so that by our means there might be revealed to him what he sought either in nails smeared by some consecrated oil or chrism, or in the clean smooth body of a basin. When then after first uttering some names which seemed to me, by the horror I felt at them, child as I was, to be those of demons, and making some preliminary adjurations which thank God I do not know, my comrade had declared that he saw some shapes though but dim and cloudy, I for my part turned out so blind at this business that nothing was visible to me but the nails or basin and the rest of the things that I already knew to be there. So after this I was judged useless for this sort of thing and was condemned as a hinderer of this sacrilegious proceeding not to come near any such ; and as often as they had resolved to engage in these practices I was shut out as an impediment to any divination. So gracious was the Lord to me in my tender age ; and when I had grown somewhat older I came more and more to abhor this crime, and my abhorrence of it received a great confirmation from the fact that of many of whom I then knew that engaged in it, I saw all before they died bereft of sight either by disease or violence, not to speak of other troubles whereby the Lord overthrew or afflicted them before my eyes, with the exception of two only, the priest of whom I spoke above and a certain deacon who saw the judgements

which awaited crystal gazers and fled, the one to the bosom of a church of canons, the other to the harbour of a Cluniac cell, where they put on the religious habit. Yet even there these men I saw with pity afterwards suffering adversity above the rest of their fellows in the congregations which they joined.'

John, whose censure of the observation of signs does not embrace the observation of purely natural indications, ends with some remarks upon the physicians who study these. They are either men of theory or men of practice. The former must not be betrayed by their studies into opposing the faith. He has too often fallen for his sins into the hands of the latter to care to vex them by speaking against them. He will rather follow Solomon's advice and honour them; but he does not deny himself some hits at their foibles and at the Salernitan maxim, *Dum dolet accipe*, 'Take your fee while the patient is ill.'

The third book, directed against the enemies of the commonwealth, is mainly concerned with the censure of flatterers of every sort and kind, whom of all such enemies John reckons to be the most deadly. Noteworthy in this book are his variations on the theme that 'all the world's a stage,' where if one actor's part be taken away, another's is gone too, as we see in such a case as Cleopatra's was when Augustus refused to play the part of Julius Caesar. The play of human life is a comedy or a tragedy, according to the point of view; the spectators before whom it is played are God and the angels and those wise and good men in whose souls there is a peace as of Elysium untroubled by the ups and downs of fortune.

In the next book we are told what a true prince is. He is the servant of the law, bearing not only his own burden like a private person, but also the burdens of all the citizens. He is the head of the body politic and the image of the divine majesty on earth. When Attila announced himself as the 'scourge of God,' a certain pious bishop raised the chant, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,' and admitted the persecutor to his church. If even persecuting power is so venerable, how much more must be a legally constituted

authority? The true prince has no private will; he is the embodiment of equity and may shed blood without guilt, because without enmity or anger. The sword which he bears he receives from the Church and so may be regarded as the minister of the priesthood, appointed to perform functions which it would be below their own dignity to discharge themselves; the inferiority of the prince to the priesthood is illustrated from Saul's deposition by Samuel, Constantine's reverence to the Nicene fathers, Theodosius' submission to St. Ambrose. The prince's duty to God is a duty without qualification; that to his country comes next, then that to his kinsfolk, lastly that to foreigners. But his country must come for him as far as his office goes before his own kinsfolk, and this is typified by the saying of Melchizedek that he was without father or mother. Referring, it would seem, to some apocryphal Acts of Paul, John quotes the Apostle as illustrating to the Athenians the self-sacrifice of Christ by that of Codrus and Lycurgus for their peoples. The law of the kings of Israel as laid down in Deuteronomy is then commented upon sentence by sentence, and each precept illustrated by numerous examples. The reward there promised to good princes of a long reign may perhaps be interpreted of their eternal happiness in the world to come, wherein they will surpass their subjects inasmuch as their opportunities of doing evil have been far greater. But the literal meaning is not excluded; and so with the second part of the promise that their sons shall reign after them, this refers to succession in their earthly thrones as well as in their endless bliss. Hereditary kingship is on many accounts the rule 'by God's ancient gift,' but princes must not prefer their children to their people; 'for even God "spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all"': and descent is ever less important than merit in a ruler. 'Mine host at Piacenza,' a place where Englishmen of that day were wont to stay on their way to Rome, 'a man of good birth having the wisdom of this world in the fear of the Lord, bore witness to the close connexion of political prosperity in Italy with the cultivation of peace, justice, and honesty; whenever

these were neglected God brought upon them the pride of the Romans, the fury of the Germans, or some other scourge. And so kingly power is transferred from one royal house to another for any of the four kinds of sin enumerated in Ecclesiasticus x. 8 (according to the Vulgate version) injustice which does not punish wrong done, injuriousness which itself wrongs others, scornfulness which from an overweening conceit of self is careless of wronging others, and crafty cunning; the opposites respectively of the four cardinal virtues, justice, temperance or self-restraint, prudence or wisdom, and fortitude.

We are not yet done with our consideration of the royal office. The fifth book pursues the subject now under the guidance of a treatise, which is unknown to us except from the use made of it in the *Policraticus* and which John believed to be the work of Plutarch—the *Institutio Trajani* on which our fifth and sixth books form a commentary. This treatise, though certainly not Plutarch's, would seem to have been a production of a period before the disappearance of the ancient religion, or if, as is perhaps not impossible, the paganism is only assumed along with the authorship and the occasion, at least of a period long anterior to John's own; and even the work of a writer with access to Plutarch's genuine writings, which have certainly been used in its composition. The old comparison of the state to a human body was here carried out into detail with great thoroughness: the priesthood corresponds to the soul, the prince to the head, the senate to the heart, the judges and governors of provinces to the eyes, ears and tongue, the officers and soldiers to the hands, the courtiers to the sides, the quaestors and registrars to the digestive organs, the husbandmen to the feet. Trajan, for whose instruction in his imperial duties the book professed to have been written, was by tradition considered to have been the best of all the heathen Emperors; of him was related the legend immortalized by Dante, that on account of his justice to a poor widow his soul was delivered by the prayers of St. Gregory the Great from the torments of hell. The story is told by John; who, however, like our earliest authorities

for the tale, John the Deacon, does not go so far as with Dante to translate him to Paradise. The theological difficulty involved in this story was met by St. Thomas Aquinas by the suggestion that Trajan was recalled to life, and so received the grace of baptism. John's discussion in his fifth book of the different orders in the community, priests, princes, judges, provincial governors, is enriched by an abundance of stories from Scripture, mythology, and ancient history; we will only mention the few examples taken from the events of his own time; they all illustrate the incorruptibility which it behoves magistrates to exhibit. Pope Eugenius III would take no gift from any suitor whose cause was pending, and said to a poor priest who offered him a golden mark before his suit had been heard, 'You have not yet entered the house, and do you wish to corrupt the master of it?' Bernard of Rennes, a monk of St. Bernard's abbey of Clairvaux and one of Eugenius' cardinals, during his residence at Rome was eminent for his refusal of all presents of money whatever. Martin, a cardinal of Innocent II's creation, returning, 'contrary to common wont a poor man,' from serving as the Pope's Legate in Denmark, reluctantly accepted from the Bishop of Florence a horse for his attendant, who was without one, but returned it when he learned that the donor had a suit in the court of Rome. This story John takes from St. Bernard *de Consideratione*; as also that of the like strictness of Geoffrey, Bishop of Chartres, Papal Legate in Aquitaine, in respect of presents offered him by his provincials. But these, John implies, were exceptions. He speaks with no little severity of the venality of English officials, whether temporal as sheriffs or justices in eyre or spiritual as deans and archdeacons. Probably nothing in our author's works has more often been quoted than the letter written to congratulate a friend who had just been appointed Archdeacon of Huntingdon, in which he banters him on having formerly been in the habit of pitying archdeacons as a band of men who could not hope for salvation. The 'simoniacal pravity' of these dignitaries, who could seldom, it seems, resist the temptation to make money out of their office,

with its great possibilities in the way of exaction, was a constant theme, not only with John, but with the writers of that time in general.

The sixth book continues the commentary on the *Institutio Trajani* and deals with the hands of the state, whether unarmed as tax-gatherers and the like or armed as soldiers. The greater part is devoted to this latter class. Much of what John has to say of the choice of soldiers, of what they should know, and how they should live, is taken from the ancient Latin author Vegetius and cannot be used as material for the history of his own day. But in the sixth chapter is an interesting notice of contemporary affairs which suggests that in the South African War we were in some respects true to a very old tradition. In the reign of Henry II the Welshman was found as hard to catch as the Boer in that of Victoria. John tells us how 'they come out of their caves and woods and invade the level country, assault and storm the fortresses, destroy them or keep them for themselves, under the very eyes of our highborn chieftains,' while the flower of the English youth were passing their time in amusements. Then he goes on—

'They waste our marches while our youth is getting ready; and while our soldiers are arming the enemy is off again and (as the proverb has it) before the dog has done growling the wolf is safe in her lair. There is no one to overtake the enemy as he retreats or to go in pursuit of him because in their heavy equipment they are of no use against a lightarmed foe. Yet he does not take refuge within walls or trenches but in places with which he is indeed better acquainted than are our men, but which are notwithstanding accessible to the latter. He is safe there all the same because our soldiers trust not in their own valour but in their equipment.'

Very different success had attended Harold in his Welsh campaign in the days of Edward the Confessor, because he was a really skilful general who understood that the methods of warfare must be adapted to the particular circumstances, and by adopting a mode of arming and fighting similar to those of the Welsh themselves had pursued them into their mountain fortresses, and in two years completely subjugated

them. 'See what can be done with a careful choice of one's general and a proper training of one's troops!' John attaches great importance to the soldiers' oath of loyalty, which the Christian emperors took over from their heathen predecessors, giving it the Christian form in which we find it stated by Vegetius. An unsworn soldier is like an undaunted priest or clerk; he is no true soldier at all, but a brigand. There should be no disaffection on the part of the soldiery toward the unarmed spiritual service, the clergy, in whose defence they should be ready to shed their blood, if need should be. Their loyalty to God must come even before loyalty to their prince; although a soldier may fight loyally for a heathen sovereign, as David did for Achish and many Christians for Diocletian and Julian. How can a prince trust a soldier to be loyal to him who violates his prior obligations to God which are included in the military oath itself? Even though no express oath bind the soldier to the service of the Church he is implicitly bound to it by duty and religion; the custom of the new-made knight laying his sword upon the altar can have no other meaning. The need of sound discipline is earnestly dwelt upon. Its decay in his own time John deplores, and repeats how, while those who should be defending the frontiers spend their time in luxury and vice and in killing the distant Saracens without blood—'with their mouth,' as Mr. Kipling might say—the unarmed Welshmen wax insolent and force those who are called Earl Palatine and boast of their royal descent to a humiliating surrender. He has doubtless in his mind the disastrous defeat of Ralph, Earl of Chester, about twenty-three years before the date at which he is writing.

'There is no one,' he says, 'who is willing to join battle with them or to try what they can do in a fair fight under equal conditions.' The English will challenge them to fight in the level country where their own armour gives them advantage over the unarmed Welsh, 'but no one of our people pursues them, unarmed though they be, to their forests, from distrust of their own strength.' Would they had remembered what Florus says of the Cisalpine Gauls: "'They have the temper of wild beasts and bodies of more than human

stature ; but it has been found by experience that in their first onset their courage is greater than man's, but in the next less than woman's ; for their Alpine frames reared under a wet sky are somewhat like their native snows, once they are warmed by battle, their strength melts away."'' So if there were anyone who would attack our Welsh foes, instead of awaiting their assaults, they would doubtless be beaten ; but meanwhile a host of unarmed, unwarlike savages devastates an armed province ; hungry at home, they satisfy their appetites upon our abundance. For our soldiers by not repelling them as good as give way to them. If neither love of country, nor love of property or even of security will stir them up, at least they should be ashamed of their sluggishness when they see the unarmed Welshmen boasting over them. Would that the wives and mothers of our marches would drive their menfolk back to the field as the Persian women are said to have done theirs when they turned to fly before the Median invaders. It is perhaps curious that John should proceed to stir up his countrymen to military ardour by insisting on the past glories of their race in the days of Brennus, who came (as Geoffrey of Monmouth had lately taught his readers) from 'Greater Britain, which since the Saxons came into the island is called England,' invaded Italy, founded Milan and Como, Brescia and Verona, Bergamo, Trent and Vicenza, left a colony at Siena (John is the first extant authority for this legend), where the fairness of the inhabitants still attests their northern blood, took Rome and overran Greece, where only the direct intervention of Apollo saved the Delphic sanctuary from out of his hands. For one might have thought that the Welsh raiders had a nearer interest in these triumphs than the English marchers. He has, however, examples of English valour more recent than this to set before his contemporaries, examples which will shew that it is not native valour that Englishmen lack but military knowledge, practice, and skill—and perhaps a leader. He recalls the victories which Cnut's forces won over the Danes and Norsemen, and tells us that Kent, *Cantia nostra*, where he and Becket, whom he is addressing, had

alike been domiciled in the household of Archbishop Theobald, had won the right still retained to fight in the van of the English army. Master Wace also mentions this privilege in the *Roman de Rou*. John does not forget to add that his own native county of Wiltshire had the right (along with Devon and Cornwall) to the next place after Kent. The capture of Le Mans under William Rufus, the victories of Henry I over Lewis VI of France and over the faction of his brother, Duke Robert of Normandy, the early triumphs of the reigning sovereign, Henry II, who had held his own against the combined forces of the kings of France and England 'and a more savage enemy than either, Eustace the husband of the French King's sister,' had successfully besieged Crowmarsh and Chinon, kept Brittany from breaking out into open revolt, and induced Theobald of Blois to restore him the castles of which he had been robbed in his minority—all this had been accomplished with the help of English valour or of the terror which it inspired in the enemy. Eugenius III said that but for their levity the English were by nature fitter than men of any other nation for any enterprise they might choose to undertake; so it is to be expected that with good training and discipline the English soldiery would be honoured by all as the defenders of their country.

'The feet of the state' are the labourers in the mechanical arts and in agriculture. The care of their interests is the great business of the magistrate, upon their protection by their rulers depends the safety and prosperity of the state, which, when they are exposed to harm, goes, as it were, unshod. Plutarch sends Trajan to learn from the bees, as Vergil describes them in his *Georgics*, the true principles of a commonwealth. Now bees shew the most reverent submission to their king (the queen bee was of course thought until modern times to be a king), and so the utility of his office should reconcile subjects even to put up with some little hardship at their sovereign's hands. And here John gives us a reminiscence of his own. He was staying at Benevento with his intimate friend Hadrian IV, who had been Nicholas Breakspear, the only Englishman that ever was

Pope, from whom (as he tells us in the *Metalogicon*) he obtained for Henry II the grant of Ireland with a golden ring in which a fine emerald was set in token of investiture ; all islands by the donation of Constantine belonging of right to the Roman Church. Hadrian asked his friend one day what men said of him and of the Roman Church ; and John freely told him how he had heard it complained that the mother of all churches was rather a stepmother than a true mother, that there sat in it scribes and Pharisees binding on others' shoulders grievous burdens they did not touch themselves with one of their fingers, lords over the clergy rather than patterns to the flock, heaping up precious furniture, piling their tables with gold and silver, miserly, proud, unmerciful, venal, rejoicing in the spoils of churches and counting all gain for godliness. The Roman pontiffs themselves, it was said, were unbearably oppressive, they went clad in purple and gold, neglected the churches and altars which their predecessors' devotion had founded to build new palaces for themselves. ' This, father, is what the people say, since you wish me to repeat their opinion.' ' And what do you think ? ' said the Pope. John professed himself in a dilemma between the fear of being guilty of flattery and that of being guilty of treason ; and took refuge in the authority of Cardinal Guido Dens, who in an assembly of his brethren held at Ferentino asserted openly that the avarice of the Roman Church was the head and root of all evils. On this occasion it would seem that the cardinal had fallen foul of John himself, who was probably much engaged with such English business as came before the court of Rome ; we know from what John tells us in his *Historia Pontificalis* that some such business was in hand on the occasion to which he here refers. Continuing to answer Hadrian, he admits that he has nowhere found more upright clergymen than in the Roman Church—he mentions particularly Cardinal Bernard of Rennes, of whom we have already heard, and Guarino of Bologna, Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, who even refused his share of the common property belonging to the College of Cardinals. But he cannot deny without lying to the Holy Ghost that in general it is with the Roman hierarchy as with

the Pharisees of old ; what they command should be done, but not all their works are to be imitated. ' Who dissents from your teaching is either a heretic or a schismatic ; but by God's mercy there are some who do not imitate the works of all of you.' The Pope himself is called father and lord, but does not act as such. He expects presents and rewards from his children ; he does not govern and correct his turbulent Romans, and tries to preserve the city for the Church by bribery. But, asks John, did Silvester (' il primo ricco padre,' as Dante calls him) obtain it first by such means ? ' Freely ye have received, freely give. Justice is queen of virtues and blushes to be sold for money. While you oppress others, you are yourself yet more grievously oppressed.' He is thinking of the vexatious conduct of the Roman nobles, of which we know from a later chapter Hadrian himself at other times bitterly complained to his friend as making him continually regret his early youth in England or the quiet of his later life in the cloister in St. Rufus' Abbey near Avignon. But on the present occasion he only laughed, bade John always tell him as freely what people said of him, and repeated as his own apology the ancient fable of the belly and the members.

With the sixth book the first great division of the *Policraticus* closes ; and John, expressing his resolution to follow the advice of Becket, not to leave the court but to beguile his time there by the study of philosophy, passes from the *nugae curialium* to the *vestigia philosophorum*. We will not linger on the summary history of ancient philosophy which follows, though it presents many points of interest. His own preference he does not conceal. It is, as we have already seen, for the modest philosophy of the Academy which will not dogmatize on those things of which a wise man may doubt. He is ever a humanist. He has nothing but contempt for those who are content to exercise their wit and waste their lives on controversies which turn about a few logical words or phrases ; such as those who concentrated their attention almost wholly on the obscurities in Porphyry's Introduction to Aristotle's Categories, ' Porphyriolus,' as he scornfully calls it. A man is not ' lettered '

unless he read poets and orators, historians and mathematicians, though all this reading will not bring wisdom without the grace of God. Everything may be read and the good extracted and used; this is intimated by the donation of all sorts of food to our first parents in a state of innocence and also to the sons of Noah after the flood—that is, when restored by grace after punishment for sin. St. Jerome tells us 'Love the Scriptures'—John takes it in the most general sense of 'writings'—'and thou shalt not love the lusts of the flesh.' And this is the true end of philosophy which, if Plato is right in saying that the philosopher is the lover of God, is the love of God, to which no limit is set, for God is to be loved with all our heart, soul, mind and strength. Very different from the true philosopher are the verbal triflers whose more thorough castigation John reserves for the *Metalogicon*, where he tells us how, when after twelve years' absence he returned to the Mont St. Geneviève at Paris, where he too had sat with them as a youth at the feet of Abelard, the great 'Peripatetic of Pallet,' he found them 'just where they were before,' occupied in logical puzzles, and prouder than ever of their occupation, treating as an end in itself that logical art which, useful though it be as a preparation for more advanced studies, can bear the fruit of true philosophy only when impregnated by other sciences. Incidentally John here gives us a glimpse of the current controversies about universals, and speaks of pure nominalism as having expired with its author Roscellinus, though he hints that others who would be ashamed to call themselves his followers are really nominalists, making out universals to be not indeed *voces*, but what comes to much the same thing, *sermones*. From a passage in the *Metalogicon* it would seem that in this criticism he is glancing at no less a thinker than Abelard himself. If, however, we are to pass beyond the mere logic-chopping of these haunters of what was already the Quartier Latin of Paris, we must use the six keys of learning enumerated by the 'old man of Chartres,' Bernard, the master of the twelfth-century humanists, of whose method of teaching John has left us in the *Metalogicon* a lively account, though

he did not himself study under him, but under teachers who had formed themselves upon his model. These six keys are humbleness of heart, love of inquiry, a peaceful life, silent meditation, poverty, and exile. This enumeration Hugh of St. Victor had already in the *Eruditio Didascalica* taken as the text of a description of the scholar's life. John adds a seventh key, suggested by Quintilian, namely, the love of one's teachers. But few care to pursue wisdom for its own sake; rather they seek to compass worldly wealth by means of it. This leads John to dwell at length on the evils of covetousness, especially among ecclesiastics. He attacks the abuses to which it has given occasion in the Church; the traffic in advowsons, the excessive use of the dispensation from canonical obligations, the accumulation of benefices to be served by deputies, who do the work while others get the emoluments. He is particularly severe on the evil fashion whereby men who have obtained preferment by money or services to great men, yet, when it is offered them, pretend to refuse it, professing their unworthiness, the incompatibility of their secular pursuits, the unlawfulness of appointment except by canonical election, and so forth, in order to appear to be reluctantly forced into a place which they have notwithstanding corruptly sought. When the candidate, after his insincere *Nolo episcopari*, allows himself to be dragged at last to his throne by shouting crowds and chanting choirs, he is thought to be a man of singular modesty and his postponement of acceptance to have been due to genuine unwillingness. We see how easily a cynic like William Rufus might misjudge in St. Anselm a hesitation which, however genuine in his case, was almost as a matter of course simulated by the most unscrupulous place-hunters. Where there is nothing in a man's past or present career to recommend him, his friends, says John, take to prophesying a great future, like a horse-dealer who, by his promises of what he will prove hereafter, diverts his customer's attention from the uneven paces of the beast he is leading gingerly into his dupe's stable. But there is a yet more shameless sort of ecclesiastical place-hunters, who do not even simulate reluctance or

dissemble the means they have used to secure their promotion. Such should be treated as Robert, the English Chancellor of King Roger of Sicily, treated the simoniacal candidates for the vacant see of Avellana. There were there an abbot, an archdeacon, and the brother of a certain lay official ; the Chancellor agreed independently with each for a sum of money, but when the day of election came, publicly revealed the whole affair and declared that he would henceforth act according to the judgement of the bishops of the province ; whereupon a poor monk was canonically elected, but each of the simoniacal candidates was compelled to pay up what he had promised to the very last farthing ! An entertaining passage here follows in which the canvasser for ecclesiastical preferment is shewn as turning the edge of every objection by some example of a like defect among the saints. If he is of low birth, so was St. Peter ; if under age, so were Jeremiah and St. John the Baptist when first set apart ; if a youth, so was Daniel when he defended Susanna ; if unlearned, so were the Apostles ; if married, so were the bishops whom St. Paul said should be chosen ; if he has deserted his wife, so (according to the apocryphal story which made him the bridegroom of Cana) did St. John ; if of a slow tongue like Moses, an Aaron can be found to speak for him ; if a companion of harlots, so by God's command was Hosea ; if foolish, by the foolishness of the world God determined to save them that believe. St. Peter's assault on the High Priest's servant will serve as an excuse for violence, the timidity of Jonah and St. Thomas for cowardice, the tax-gathering of St. Matthew for the ties of public functions. If he is accused of gluttony and wine-bibbing, so was our Lord ; if of insubordination, St. Paul withstood St. Peter to the face. Contention was not unknown among the Apostles, St. Paul was called a babbler, St. Martin was a soldier, Moses a secret and Samuel an open homicide ; St. Peter forswore himself ; Zacharias, though dumb, discharged the office of a priest ; St. Paul was blind when Ananias laid his hands upon him, a deaf man can preach though he cannot hear ; Christ Himself was, according to tradition, like a leper, ' without form or comeliness.' The

objection that he was of despicable condition was brought against St. Martin, St. Cyprian erred in doctrine, St. Gregory the Great was an invalid, St. Brice was proud and vain, the confessor Paphnutius was mutilated, the sons of Zebedee canvassed for the first places in the Kingdom of Heaven, St. Augustine had been a Manichee, Marcellinus the Pope had committed idolatry, St. Ambrose was not yet baptized when chosen bishop, St. Paul had been a persecutor, the Apostles themselves were not canonically elected by the people, and so on.

But even ignorant laymen reprove these unworthy priests, as Balaam's ass reproved his master the prophet. The ancient Christian Emperors made many laws to exclude officers of the state or the court from ecclesiastical charges ; but these are not obeyed, and the court candidates for Church preferment rage against assertors of ecclesiastical rights as traitors to their prince. The views to which John gives utterance in these chapters find a commentary in Becket's change of attitude after his elevation to the see of Canterbury, and in our author's steady support of him thereafter against the King and the court party. From simoniacs John passes to hypocrites who conceal their covetousness under a show of extraordinary sanctity. As we should expect from a writer who was not himself a monk, he finds his chief examples of hypocrisy among the religious orders, although these, so far as they live up to their profession, he pronounces to be worthy of all respect : Carthusians, Cistercians, Cluniacs, regular canons, hermits, Templars, Hospitallers and all. But there are reprobates among them, as indeed there was an apostate angel, a reprobate prophet, a traitor apostle. He describes these false pretenders to exceptional holiness, their show of humility and zeal, their greed for tithes, their invasion of other men's rights, their claim to the special protection of the Roman Church. Their injurious privileges were indeed to some extent limited by Pope Hadrian IV (who must have been dead when this passage was added, though the *Policraticus* was, for the most part, written in his lifetime ; and the *Metalogicon*, its sequel, ends with a lament over his then recent decease), though he

would not abolish them all. Yet he allowed the Templars to hold benefices with cure of souls, and so, although shedding blood by profession, 'in a sense'—by deputy, that is—to minister the blood of Christ, contrary to the canons. The conduct of these unworthy monks is a great hindrance to religion, and a scandal to their profession: while monks who live up to their profession are the truest philosophers of all, these are Epicurean hypocrites (he plays on the similar sounding names) who profess philosophy but follow their own desires, and successors of the Pharisees, with whom our Lord, who ate and drank with publicans and sinners, would have no peace at all. From the censure on monastic hypocrites are excluded two societies: that of the Carthusians, and that of the Order of Grammont, then recently established in the place in the Limousin to which it owed its name. One hypocrite, indeed, to John's knowledge, joined the Carthusian Order for worldly ends; but he afterwards left it again, and no such story has he yet heard of the Order of Grammont, who recognize as their master not Basil or Benedict or Augustine, but only the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The praise of these two Orders is not intended to suggest that sanctity is not to be found in others. Some of these may rank with the highest of those who follow the stricter rules; just as, although virginity is a higher state than matrimony, martyrdom than confessorship, some married persons are holier than many virgins (we may remark that the first married Archbishop of Canterbury, while the Corpus MS. was in his hands, has approvingly scored this remark with his red pencil), some confessors than some martyrs. Yet the least holy monk leads of necessity a life which would be considered most religious if lived by a secular person, such as the author himself. After hypocrites, envious persons and slanderers of all kinds are described and censured; and the tendency to detract from one's superiors, which we observe in the chapter and the cloister no less than in the court and the school, is illustrated by an anecdote of John's distinguished contemporary, 'the venerable father Gilbert, Bishop of Hereford'—Gilbert Foliot, that is, of whom in later days,

when he had become a principal opponent of Becket, we shall find John in his letters speaking with much less respect. Gilbert said to John that when he was a simple monk he would blame his superiors' lack of zeal; when he was somewhat advanced in the Order he pitied the faults of his equals, but still did not spare them of yet higher rank; when a prior he had sympathy with priors but still carped at abbots; when an abbot (he had been Abbot of Gloucester) he felt kindly towards his fellow-abbots and turned his attention to the faults of bishops; now at last, a bishop himself, he spared his colleagues in the episcopate. John adds that he does not suppose that Gilbert was himself of an envious disposition; he was no doubt only describing in a striking way an innate tendency of human nature.

At the beginning of the eighth and last book John announces his purpose of exploring the camp of the Epicureans, that is of the professed votaries of pleasure, whom he divides into two groups, each represented by a character in Terence's *Eunuchus*, a play in which the poet 'has given us a picture of wellnigh the whole of human life': one by Thraso, the swaggering soldier, the other by Gnatho, his toady and parasite. The vainglory which distinguishes Thraso and his school is, according to St. Gregory, the first offshot of the primal sin, which is pride, and (as Boethius had said) a fault from which even the noblest spirits are seldom free. This last familiar sentiment from the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, which was all but a sacred book to the Middle Ages, is expressed elsewhere by John in a verse which more closely expresses than the original phrase the famous line of Milton through which we now best know the thought: *Haec est praestantes quae deserit ultima mentes*, 'That last infirmity of noble minds.' We will not follow John through his illustration and censure of various principal vices; but some points of interest in his invective against gluttony may be mentioned. One is his account of a luxurious banquet at which he and John, Treasurer of York (that is, John Whitehands, afterwards Bishop of Poitiers and Archbishop of Lyons), were once present at Canosa in Apulia 'from the ninth hour of the day to the twelfth hour of the

night and that at the equinox.' There were delicacies from Constantinople, Babylon, Alexandria, Palestine, Tripoli, Barbary, Syria, Phoenicia, 'as though Sicily, Calabria, Apulia and Campania were not sufficient to furnish forth a dainty banquet.' The magnificence of this entertainment it needs the eloquence of his companion and namesake to tell, who is skilled in the three languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, 'above any man that I have seen.' We could have spared many particulars from Petronius and Macrobius for some more details of this feast. But to John himself, naturally enough, reminiscences of his classical reading were more interesting. Yet his quotations of Petronius and Macrobius in this passage have a special interest of their own. We find from the first that he knew that part of Petronius' romance which is called the 'Supper of Trimalchio.' This was not included in the copies known to the scholars of the Renaissance, but came to light in the year 1650, when Marino Statileo found it in a manuscript at Trau in Dalmatia. Now, a little more than two centuries earlier, in 1420, Poggio Bracciolini mentions in a letter that he had found and sent to his friend Niccolo Niccoli from England a 'bit of Petronius,' and Mr. A. C. Clark has given good reasons for suspecting that the scribe of the Trau MS., which is dated just three years after Poggio's letter, had transcribed the 'Supper' from this very find of Poggio's. It is, as Mr. Clark points out, noticeable that an English scholar should have been the only person known to have been acquainted with the 'Supper' in the Middle Ages; and it is likely enough that Poggio's fragment was somehow related to the copy used by John. With regard to Macrobius, the eighth book of the *Policraticus* proves conclusively, in the judgement of its most recent editor, that John had before him a much more complete copy of the *Saturnalia* than we at present possess; and some of the now missing portions could be to a certain extent reconstructed and some new words added to the lexicons from his extracts. Among the comparatively rare allusions in the *Policraticus* to the history of his own country we may mention the complaint of William the Conqueror's policy, after his

assumption of the English crown and the pacification of his new kingdom, of sending to foreign nations for whatever they could import that was wonderful or grand, so that 'there flowed into an island which was already wealthy and almost the only one in the world that is self-sufficing, whatever could be found magnificent, not to say luxurious.' He would have done better, thinks John, to have imitated Augustus Caesar, who, after pacifying Rome, imposed on his subjects laws in restraint of the luxury of the table. Not uninteresting also, as a comment on the life of his time, is John's complaint 'of the incivility, not to say inhumanity' of the Cistercian rule forbidding flesh to be placed before guests or anything to be bought on their account; whereas St. Benedict had allowed his priors even to break all but the principal fasts for the sake of hospitality in entertaining strangers.

Towards the end of the last book we find ourselves returning to the subject with which the fourth book opened—that of the difference between the prince and the tyrant. Then the prince was described; now the tyrant has his turn. There is, John tells us, a false State opposed to that which Plutarch describes to Trajan; a state with a tyrant for its head, a schismatical, heretical and sacrilegious priesthood for its soul, a senate of unjust counsellors for its heart, unjust judges and officers for its eyes, tongue and unarmed hand, a robber soldiery for its armed hand, for its feet an impious and rebellious commons. There are tyrant priests, who are hirelings or even robbers instead of shepherds. He applies Ezekiel's denunciation of such to the hierarchy of his own day, and in his denunciation of corruption in high places he only seems to spare the Holy See itself, 'which may not be judged of any man,' while in fact his attack is all the more bitter for its irony.

'It cannot be believed,' he cries, 'that the legates of the Roman Church, which by God's authority is the mother and nurse of faith and morals—that they should presume or condescend to do what by the laws of the heathen is unlawful for Caesar's legates the governors of provinces. How shameless would it be for the disciple of the Crucified, the vicar of Peter,

the shepherd of souls, to dare commit crimes which in the times of unbelief the vicar of the Emperor and ruler of men's bodies did not venture to attempt.'

The tyrant is the devil's image as the true prince was God's; he may be slain, while the true prince should be revered. John's approval of tyrannicide is often quoted. He has already remarked, when dealing with flatterers in the third book, that those only it is lawful to flatter whom it is also lawful to slay. The overthrow of the laws by the tyrant is the supreme treason, and may be avenged by any citizen, who in failing to do so is false to himself and the commonwealth. His language perhaps seemed less startling to him than to some of his later readers; it was a natural development of the republican phraseology which he found in Cicero; and we have no reason to think that he was ever disposed to make a practical application of it, although in his later correspondence he commonly wrote of Frederick Barbarossa, who was supporting an anti-pope at the time, and so was in John's eyes schismatical, as 'the Teutonic tyrant.' Yet nowhere does he hint at the lawfulness of assassinating him, even when he rejoices at the Pope's suspension of him from his imperial dignity and release of his subjects from their allegiance. And tyrants may indeed, he expressly tells us, be God's ministers and may, notwithstanding their lawless and tyrannical government, like Saul, claim to be called the Lord's anointed, a title given in Scripture even to the heathen Cyrus, because he executed God's judgement against Babylon. Indeed, though insisting that tyrants usually come to violent ends, and illustrating this from the history of those Roman emperors, from Julius Caesar to Commodus, who deserved the name, he adds, speaking of Severus, who as a persecutor of the Christians is counted a tyrant and whose death is noticed though he was posterior in date to Commodus, lest John should seem to spare the reputed founder of his birthplace, Salisbury, that he died by natural causes at York, 'since Britain has ever abhorred poisons and has learned to wield the unconquered swords of her sons not against her princes but in their defence.' Yet one must not suppose that he escaped

the penalty of his tyrannical behaviour towards the Christians, which (it is hinted) he paid after his death, when he must have come to share the damnation of the fallen angel whose image he as a tyrant had borne on earth. Passing by the tyrants of ancient times, whose fate John proceeds to describe (promising by the way a separate little book *de Exitu Tyrannorum*, which either was never written or has not survived), we may, as before, touch upon the examples which he takes from English history. These include Sweyn of Denmark and Eustace, the son of King Stephen, who were both slain in daring to violate the territory of St. Edmund's monastery at Bury in Suffolk; and also the turbulent nobles of the time of anarchy in Stephen's reign with whom Mr. Round deals in his *Geoffrey de Mandeville*: Geoffrey himself, Earl of Essex; Miles, Earl of Hereford; Ralph, Earl of Chester; Alan, Earl of Richmond; Simon of Senlis, Earl of Northampton; and Gilbert Clare, Earl of Pembroke (son of the founder of Tintern and father of the conqueror of Ireland); William, Earl of Salisbury; and Robert Marmion; all of whom came to tragic ends, 'of which our present age cannot be ignorant.' Tyranny has its origin in the love of power; the true prince should rather imitate Gideon, who modestly declined the kingly dignity, than those who are now more often taken as patterns, princes who were not afraid to do despite to God's honour by unlawful interference like Uzziah, who intruded into the priestly office, Antiochus, who set up the abomination in the holy place and burned the books of God's law, or Stephen, who confiscated Archbishop Theobald's and others' copies of the Roman law and silenced Vacarius, the first teacher of it in this country. It is interesting to observe this view of the Roman law as a sacred thing. It is connected with John's deep sense of the spiritual significance of the international unity of Christian civilization under the universal Roman law, and the universal spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter's successor as a divine ordinance against the separatist tendencies of the different national kingdoms, whose ultimate sanction was to be found in force rather than in reason and revelation. This conviction made him (as we have seen) the strongest

supporter of Becket in his struggle with Henry II, as also of Alexander III in his conflict with Frederick Barbarossa. For John the two quarrels were in principle the same ; his clear perception of the faults of the papal court no more affected his attitude in the one than his intimate acquaintance with the defects of Becket in the other. On the other hand, while he is ready enough on occasion, even in letters written in the midst of the fight, to bear witness to the great qualities of Henry II, which in the *Polycraticus*, written before it began, he praises so highly, he nowhere admits for a moment that there is anything to be said on the King's side ; nowhere does he suggest that he had, in Herbert of Bosham's famous phrase, 'a zeal for God.' This is the more remarkable because we know from his account of St. Bernard and Gilbert de la Porrée that he was well able to conceive a dispute in which either party was defending a good cause. The love of power, John goes on, is found even in priests. There have been bloody conflicts even between rival candidates for the Roman pontificate. He had no doubt read of those at the accession of Damasus ; but he had more recent examples before him in the struggles between Innocent II and the anti-pope Anaclete II, 'the son of Pierleone,' the scandal of which he bitterly deplores. The experience of one who was a Pope's intimate friend had taught him that no condition was more toilsome, nor, so far as this world is concerned, more wretched than a Pope's.

'If he is the servant of covetousness, that is death to him ; if he is not, he will not escape the hands and tongues of the Romans. If he have not the wherewithal to stop their mouths and bind their hands, he must harden his ears, eyes and heart to endure reproaches and sacrilegious crimes.' It is no empty title of his, as some think, that of *servus servorum*. Against his will, if not with it, he must perforce serve the servants of God. After all there is none who does not serve. Even the Persons of the Holy Trinity serve in dispensing the divine mercy or justice. Angels and men, whether good or evil, all serve ; even the devil who is prince of this world. 'And so too the Romans serve God

and those tyrants whom the Roman Pontiff must needs serve if he is not to be ex-pontiff or ex-Roman,' that is, either to resign the dignity or go into exile. The author's friend, Hadrian IV, told him that no one is in a more wretched condition than the Pope. If no other harm come to him, he must soon break down through mere overwork. By comparison with the present all the bitterness of his past life seemed sheer delight. The pontifical chair is stuffed with thorns, 'il gran manto' (as Nicholas III called it in speaking to Dante in hell) is stuck full of sharp prickles and so heavy as to crush the stoutest shoulders, mitre and crown may well seem splendid, for they are made of fire. 'The Lord hath even laid me as it were upon the anvil and under the hammer; may He now be pleased with His own right hand to support the burden which He hath laid upon my weakness, for I cannot support it.' These were Hadrian's own words to John. 'Does not he,' asks John, 'indeed deserve misery who fights for such a prize?' However rich he be when elected, the next day he will be poor and burdened with infinite debts. What can he expect who is not called by God to this place, but, against the will of Christ in His members, is intruded into it through blind and cruel ambition, not without the shedding of his brother's blood? To do this is rather to be Romulus' successor in fratricide than Peter's in the charge of the Lord's sheepfold. Archbishop Parker has not failed to call attention with his red pencil in the Corpus MS. to these and other passages which reflect upon the papacy.

The Epicureans' way to happiness, that of pleasure, will never lead them thither. For since the Fall, wherein the lust of pleasure lost man an easier way to bliss, the true way lies not through pleasure but through toil. According to the mystical interpretation given in the commentary by Bernard Silvester (a MS. of which lies in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, but which has never been published in its entirety), the first six books of Vergil's *Aeneid* set forth to us the stages of man's life in which he seeks to have his own way, at the end whereof he is brought by his own self-will, as it were, down to hell, there to recognize his past

errors and learn that he must reach the heavenly Latium by another course. In contrast with the false is described the true way to blessedness, which the author commends to his friend Thomas. In the righteousness and the fear of God he will find, if he believe the words of Scripture, all the good things for which he is ambitious. Nor need he of necessity abandon his splendid way of life (we remember that when Chancellor he was famous for the magnificence of his dress and equipage). He may wear fine clothes and fare sumptuously every day and enjoy precedence over all his fellows; he may in a word humour the times and their bad customs, and, upright himself, use to cheat the world the very seductions with which it cheats others. He is too great a man himself to be taken in its snares.

'The illustrious king of the English, Henry the Second, greatest of the kings of Britain, if the issue of his undertakings do but match their beginning, is falling like a thunderbolt on the Garonne, and that, it is said, by your advice and under your guidance; he is besieging Toulouse with good hope of success, not only terrifying the men of Provence as far as the Rhone and the Alps, but, by destroying fortresses and subjugating people, so that he seems a present terror hanging over the world, he has smitten with fear the princes of Spain and of Gaul. Amid such a troublous state of affairs, I pray you, keep innocence, and take heed to the thing that is right—and not only take heed to it yourself, command, preach it to others, let neither love nor hate, fear nor hope turn you aside from the right way.'

John ends by commending his book to the kindness of his friend and asking his readers' prayers for himself.

In the new edition of the work of which we have been trying to give the readers of this Review some notion, an effort has been made to examine more thoroughly than had previously been done the sources of John's varied erudition, and among the results of the examination are some (such as those to which reference has actually been made with regard to Petronius and Macrobius) which may be worth the attention of classical scholars. The actual extent of John's reading and knowledge can also be now better ascertained than hitherto: and this should be of service to

students of the history of mediaeval culture and of the literary tradition which the Middle Ages handed on to us from antiquity. Some light may also be thrown on the apocryphal literature and on Latin translations of Greek books current in the West in the twelfth century ; while it may also be found somewhat easier than heretofore for students of English history to estimate the actual amount of information to be obtained from the scattered references in the *Policraticus* to events of the writer's own age and of the years immediately preceding.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

ART. V.—THE JUDAISTIC CONTROVERSY, AND THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL.

1. *Das Aposteldecret nach seiner ausserkanonischen Text-gestalt.* Von G. RESCH. 'Texte und Untersuchungen,' N.F. xiii. 3. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1905.)
 2. *The Apostolic Decree, Acts xv. 20-29.* By W. SANDAY, D.D. (Leipzig: A. Deichert. 1908.)
- And other Works.

THE earliest Christian community was in Jerusalem: that it was here and not in Galilee perhaps raises a curious problem, but the fact cannot be denied. Moreover, it was a community within the limits of Judaism rather than one clearly separated from it. The disciples frequented the temple, observed the Jewish law, and believed all the articles of the Jewish faith. That which distinguished them from other Jews was that to the usual Pharisaic belief that in the last days the Messiah—the Lord's anointed—would appear on earth to break the powers of evil and to establish the kingdom of God, they added the assurance that they knew who the Messiah was. He was Jesus, who had appeared already as Son of Man—that is as Messiah in personality,

but not yet in function ¹—had been crucified and buried, and had been raised again by God to the glorified existence of the heavenly Messiah who should soon come in the clouds of heaven to inaugurate in power that Kingdom of God of which He was already the proleptic head, and the Christians were already the proleptic members, and as such had received the Holy Spirit which was to be given in the last days. This was the point on which Jews and Christians differed,—the identification or the non-identification of the Messiah, whom they both expected, with Jesus, and both parties found their common ground for argument in the Law and in the Prophets, which both regarded as the infallibly inspired word of God.

That there was, at least at intervals, somewhat severe persecution of the Christians by the Jews is plain from the narrative in the Acts, though the surprising thing rather is that there was not more. There seems indeed to have been enough persecution to act as a stimulus, but not enough really to crush the young community. The result was that Christianity spread with comparative rapidity all over Palestine, and in a few years there were communities in Judaea, Galilee, Samaria, and the districts immediately adjoining. All these communities were to some extent in touch with the parent community at Jerusalem, and were essentially Jewish. The Law and the customs were generally observed, and the doctrine was the usual Jewish Messianic belief, reinforced by the identification of the Messiah with Jesus, and probably by a new development of exegesis of the Old Testament in the direction of explaining passages, such as Isaiah liii., which refer to a suffering Servant, in relation to the Messiah, for it is on the whole improbable, though the point is not quite clear, that such an exegesis had ever previously obtained among the Jews. The question of the admission of the Gentiles was not yet actual; Christians in no sense felt that they had ceased to be Jews. It is true that there had been an open rupture between Jesus and the

¹ That this is the implication of the phrase 'Son of Man' is to be found most clearly expressed in Professor Burkitt's *Sources of the Gospels*, p. 66.

authorities of the Galilaean synagogues, but to the disciples this probably seemed to be more a domestic quarrel than the foundation of a new Church. The Christians held that the rulers of the synagogue were mistaken, and, though driven out, they felt sure that their cause was right, so that they never accepted the situation. Perhaps the most instructive parallel in modern times to their position may be found in that of the Catholic Modernists, who have frequently been disavowed by Catholic authority, but have never accepted the situation. Similarly Christianity was no doubt constantly disavowed by the Jewish authorities, but the Christians never consented to regard themselves as outside the Jewish Church.¹

According to Acts, the first step which pointed to a new development of Christianity among the Gentiles may have been the action of St. Philip in baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch, but the incident does not seem to have attracted attention, and it is quite possible that the Ethiopian was a Jew by birth, or at all events a proselyte. But, however this may be, it is plain that the really important change in the situation was introduced by the incident of Cornelius. He was a centurion stationed in Caesarea, not a Jew, but one of the class known as 'God fearers,' who accepted some part of the Jewish theology and customs without being willing to become proselytes. Through the teaching of St. Peter, who was travelling through the district, he accepted Christianity, and immediately received the Holy Spirit. St. Peter interpreted this fact to mean that he might at once be formally admitted by Baptism into the Christian community. It is important here to notice how central was the belief that Christians were men who were inspired with a Holy Spirit: there are many problems in connexion with this fact—for instance, its relation to

¹ On the continent one often hears objections to the phrase 'Jewish Church.' No doubt it is strictly and philologically an anachronism, but it may be doubted whether in England any one really feels this, and the use has been made so universal by Robertson Smith's famous *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, and is so convenient, that there seems no reason to give up using it.

Baptism—but as to the fact itself there can be no doubt. When, therefore, St. Peter found that Cornelius and his household presented all the signs of being ‘filled with the Spirit,’ he naturally was forced to the conclusion that Cornelius, Gentile though he was, had been placed within the Christian community.

The great importance of this decision of St. Peter was that it forced him, and the Church at Jerusalem with him, to acknowledge that it was both theoretically and practically possible for a Gentile to become a Christian, or, in other words, a proleptic member of the Messianic kingdom. It did not, however, settle the further question, which was sure to arise, whether Gentiles who became Christians were free from the obligation of the Jewish law. St. Peter himself does not seem at the moment to have seen clearly that this question must be faced, and his action in baptizing Cornelius was to some extent a confusion of thought. He had, before the incident of Cornelius, held that the Christian community was open to Jews, and that the method of entry was Baptism. From the gift of the Spirit he concluded that Cornelius had been divinely admitted into the Church, and therefore that the limitation of Church membership to Jews was untenable. By a strict parity of reasoning he ought to have decided that it also proved that Baptism was not the only method of entry into the Church,—for Cornelius was, by the evidence of the Spirit, among its members, though he had never been baptized. But this reasoning was not followed by St. Peter, who baptized Cornelius, opening, as it were, the door after the guest was already in the house. It was therefore possible for the Jewish Christians to argue that, even if Gentiles had been admitted into the Church, they ought to be circumcized as well as baptized. If they followed the reasoning which led Peter to admit Gentiles and reject the limitation to Jews because of the evidence of the Spirit, naturally they ought not to require circumcision; but if they followed the reasoning which led him, in spite of this evidence, to baptize Cornelius, they could logically demand circumcision as well. That this attitude was actually adopted is clear from the course

of events, though it is not actually stated in connexion with the case of Cornelius.

Thus the result of the incident of Cornelius may be stated to have been that the Christians in Jerusalem and Palestine generally recognized the admission of Gentiles to the Christian Church, but that the exact conditions imposed on them remained undetermined.

The factor which actually brought to the front the problem involved in this indetermination at Jerusalem was the direct result of Jewish persecution. In one of these outbreaks—in which St. Stephen the Protomartyr met his death—the pressure became so great that many Christians fled out of Palestine. Some of them, Cypriotes and Cyrenaeans, came to Antioch, and unlike the rest of the refugees preached to Gentiles—no doubt chiefly among the ‘God fearers’—with great success. The result was that the Church of Jerusalem sent St. Barnabas, himself a Cypriote, to investigate and superintend this new development. Barnabas at once recognized its importance, and encouraged it. So far did he go in this direction that he summoned Paul from Tarsus to help him (from which we may probably conclude that St. Paul had been carrying on similar work in that district), and a vigorous Church grew up of Gentiles who neither were circumcized nor recognized the Jewish law.

If this had been a wholly new doctrine in Judaism it would be almost inconceivable that St. Paul and St. Barnabas would have started it without further discussion, but as a matter of fact they were only following a line of thought which had already found supporters among a minority of the Jews, not only in the Diaspora but even in Jerusalem. It is, for instance, related by Josephus¹ that when Izates, king of Adiabene, was converted to Judaism, the Rabbi Ananias whom he consulted urged him not to be circumcized, because of the offence which he would give to his subjects, but to content himself with a general observance of the Jewish law, and adherence to the Jewish creed. This was almost exactly contemporaneous with the teaching of St. Barnabas and St. Paul in Antioch. A few years later

¹ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xx. 2, 5.

the Jewish writer of the fourth book of *Oracula Sibyllina*¹ promised entry into the Messianic kingdom to all of the heathen who accepted the true God, abandoned idolatry, murder, theft, fornication and sodomy, generally led a good life, and were baptized.² Nothing whatever was said of circumcision or the Jewish law. Less well attested, but quite probably true, is the story in the Babylonian Talmud (*Yebhamoth* f. 46a) that in the first century Rabbi Joshua maintained that baptism without circumcision was sufficient for the admission of a proselyte, and was opposed by Rabbi Eliezer, who argued in favour of circumcision without baptism.

Thus the more advanced position held among the Christians at Antioch as to the method by which a Gentile might be admitted was only the continuation of a discussion which had already arisen among the Jews. Neither the admission of Gentiles nor omission of circumcision were quite new things in the history of Judaism, but both represented the adhesion of the Christians at Antioch to the more liberal principles of a minority (probably found chiefly in the Diaspora) and the rejection of the

¹ The *Oracula Sibyllina* are a curious collection of Jewish and Christian verse, written in a bad imitation of Homeric Greek, giving a series of Apocalyptic prophecies. They vary in date from the first century before Christ to the third century after Christ.

In the fourth book the Sibyl is supposed to be speaking to the first generation of mankind, and gives a prophetic sketch of the successive dominations of Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, and Romans, up to the flight of Nero and the destruction of Jerusalem, and apparently mentioning the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. It then goes on to foretell that Nero will return from the East and history will close with the judgement, resurrection, and establishment of the righteous.

It is clear from this summary that the book was written during the time after the fall of Nero when his death was still doubted, and his return expected at the head of a Parthian army. This might be any time between the death of Nero and about 90 A.D. (the last false Nero appeared in 88), but the reference to Vesuvius narrows the range of possible dates to 79-90 A.D.

² The important passages are *Or. Sib.* iv. 24-33, and 162-170. The text is quoted on p. 361.

narrower and stricter point of view which was dominant in Jerusalem.

Nevertheless this narrower view was dominant not only among the Jews, but also among many of the Christians at Jerusalem, and in this way Antioch became in a few years the centre of a type of Christianity which differed from that in Jerusalem, and was adopted chiefly by Gentiles rather than by Jews. The importance of it was that, although it may possibly have been the view of St. Barnabas and St. Paul that their converts were made members of the true Jewish Church by their Baptism, this rapidly ceased to be true of the Gentile Christians themselves.¹ They had accepted much of the Jewish theology, and especially the doctrine of the Messiah, but the community which they desired to enter was the Messianic kingdom, not the Jewish Church, and to their mind it was plain that membership in this kingdom was the privilege of those who accepted the Messiah, and was independent of the Law, which was an exclusively Jewish possession. Let the Jews keep their own law, they were themselves free.

Under the leadership of St. Barnabas and St. Paul this new type of Christianity grew rapidly in extent and in importance: it was, as we see when we look back on history, inevitable that it should come into collision with the older type at Jerusalem. Sooner or later, if the unity of Christians was to be preserved, some sort of agreement had to be reached as to the conditions of membership to be demanded from Gentile Christians, and any occasion on which the representatives of Jerusalem were brought into close relations with those of Antioch was likely to give rise to discussion on this point.

¹ It is perhaps not out of place to call attention to the extremely valuable and interesting work of Professor W. Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth* ('Beiträge zur Förderung christl. Theologie,' 12 te Jahrgang [1908], 3 Heft) in which a study is made of the possible evidence for a tendency to go further in this direction than St. Paul went himself. This is an important side of the Judaistic controversy, though it does not fall within the limits of the present article.

Of such occasions we have in the Acts three or perhaps four examples, and the effect of what may be called the Antiochene movement is quite plain. The first is the mission of St. Barnabas and St. Paul from Antioch to Jerusalem with assistance for the sufferers in the time of famine. The writer of Acts somewhat exaggerates the universality of this famine, but it was undoubtedly widespread, and particularly severe in Jerusalem, where Helena, the mother of King Izates, distributed figs to the people. It is impossible to fix the date with absolute certainty, but 45 A.D. is not probably more than one year wrong in either direction. In Acts it is not stated that St. Barnabas and St. Paul discussed the treatment of the Gentile converts, or even that they saw the leaders of the Jerusalem Church, but it is improbable that at such a time St. Peter or St. James would have left Jerusalem; and just as a mission of help from Antioch to Jerusalem was an unsuitable opportunity for any public discussion as to the Antiochene movement, so it was admirably fitted for a private and friendly discussion among the leaders, and for a spirit of general concession on both sides. One of the main problems in connexion with the Epistle to the Galatians is whether the meeting described in Galatians ii. may not be best referred to some such meeting at this time, but even if this view be rejected, it still remains *a priori* probable that St. Peter and St. James were in Jerusalem,¹ and that they talked with St. Barnabas and St. Paul about the question of Gentile converts and their desirability.

Probably partly as a result of their intercourse with the Church at Jerusalem, in any case immediately after it, St. Barnabas and St. Paul undertook their first missionary journey. This was so successful that the question of Gentile

¹ The suggestion that they were too busy in the villages to come into Jerusalem seems to the present writer not very probable. Jerusalem must have been the centre of relief work, whether carried out by St. Peter and St. James, or by St. Barnabas and St. Paul, and we find it hard to think that St. Peter and St. James should have left Jerusalem just at a time when even strangers found themselves called on to relieve distress.

Christians obtained increased importance, and the Jerusalem Church appears to have sent out a rival mission, to which reference is made both in Acts and in Galatians,¹ in order to convince Christians of Gentile origin that circumcision and the law were binding on them.

The result of this conflict of propaganda was, according to Acts xv., the council at Jerusalem, which was practically a meeting between representatives of the Antiochene Church and the Jerusalem leaders. At this meeting speeches were made by St. Barnabas and St. Paul, representing Antioch, and afterwards by St. Peter and St. James, representing Jerusalem. St. Peter and St. James recognized the force of the Antiochene arguments, and the latter proposed an *eirenicon*, which was drawn up in writing and circulated among the Gentile Churches by St. Barnabas, St. Paul, Silas and Judas.² As to the historical value of this narrative opinions differ widely. What may be called the extreme right wing of criticism treats it as if it were a stenographic report, while the extreme left regards it as the purely imaginary product of the writer of Acts. The present writer believes that both extremes are wrong : there seems no good reason to suppose that the exact form of the speeches of St. Peter and St. James is anything more than St. Luke's view of the way in which they would naturally have spoken, though the substance of what they said may very probably have been communicated to him by St. Paul or Silas or some other of those present.³ Similarly the decrees have a distinct *a priori* probability if the Lucan authorship of Acts be accepted, and it may be said

¹ Acts xv. 1 ; Gal. ii. 12.

² Silas ultimately joined the Antiochene mission, but Judas returned to Jerusalem, if the Bezan text of Acts xv. 34 be trusted.

³ In speaking in this way the writer is assuming that the Acts were probably written by St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul. In so doing he is certainly open to the accusation of arguing in a circle. But it is unfortunately almost always necessary to start by assuming something. In this case the position is, that if we assume the Lucan authorship there is nothing in chapter xv. which he would not have known on good authority, and that if we turn round and treat the Lucan authorship as the question to be discussed, there is also nothing in chapter xv. which he could not have written.

with apparent reasonableness that it is far more probable that St. Luke was in a position to give the actual words of a document than of a speech. It is difficult, in fact, to understand the point of view of critics such as Professor Seeberg who accept the accounts of the speeches as accurate, but ascribe the decrees to St. Luke's imagination. It is not impossible that St. Luke had merely heard that there had been such a document, and in the usual manner of historians of his day gave a reconstruction of it when modern writers would have been content with a description; but it is also quite possible that he may have seen a copy of it. Unless one disputes the Lucan authorship of Acts, or the general historical value of the book, every *a priori* probability is in favour of the view that a decision was come to, and issued by the council at Jerusalem in the form, or something resembling the form, given in Acts xv. But what is this form? It is precisely this point which is hard to determine, owing to the complexities introduced by the textual phenomena.

The problem may be stated roughly as follows: The text of all the MSS. which represent the dominant Greek tradition—A B C, etc.—supported by the Alexandrian fathers Clement and Origen, states that the Apostles told the Gentile converts to keep themselves from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication. Thus there is a four-clause text of which the first three clauses seem, when united in this way, to give a food law,¹—to fix, as it were, the conditions of social intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians, while the last clause—against fornication—seems to have nothing to do with food, but to belong to a different category altogether.

Over against this reading is the evidence of D, the Latin version, Irenaeus (in Greek as well as in the Latin translation), Tertullian, Cyprian and other Latin writers, who omit 'things strangled,' generally² insert after the reference to fornication 'and do not do to others what you would not that they should do to you,' and at the end of all add 'ye shall do well, being carried along by the Holy Spirit.'

¹ For a different interpretation see p. 364.

² Tertullian is the extremely important exception.

Here we have clearly no food law, and not so much a statement of definite things to avoid as concrete illustrations of a moral life.

Now, the evidence of Irenaeus and Tertullian on the one hand, and of Clement on the other, shews that both these readings are very old. Moreover, the history of exegesis confirms them. For in Alexandria the Apostolic decrees were always interpreted as a food law, but in Africa (up to the time of Augustine) and in Europe as referring to the three deadly sins. Irenaeus and Tertullian were, it is true, acquainted with a food law, but they did not connect it with the Apostolic decrees.

Among modern critics there is an almost, though not quite, complete¹ agreement that the additions of the negative form of the golden rule and the reference to the Spirit cannot be original: partly because the former introduces a very harsh parenthesis or change of thought,² but chiefly because, if the golden rule had been in the text from the beginning, the interpretation of the decrees as a food law would have been impossible. This consensus of opinion has prejudiced them against the omission of 'things strangled,' which is supported by much the same witnesses, and Dr. Sanday in particular has argued that as D and Irenaeus have made a mistake in adding the golden rule, they ought not to be trusted when they omit 'things strangled.' His view is that the same people left out 'things strangled' as inserted the golden rule in order to change a food law into a moral enactment.

Against this argument serious objections can be brought. In the first place, it is not the case that the evidence for the golden rule is quite the same as that for the omission of 'things strangled'; Tertullian omits 'things strangled' but does not insert the golden rule. There is therefore important, if not extensive, evidence that the two readings are independent of each other. In the second place, there is no

¹ G. Resch, whose work on the subject entitles him to great respect, is the most important exception.

² 'From which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well,' reads awkwardly after the golden rule.

historical evidence whatever that the circles which can be shewn to have read a text which omitted 'things strangled' had any objection to a food law. On the contrary Gaul,¹ in which Irenaeus lived in the second century, observed a food law, and Tertullian, the other earlier witness for the omission, observed a food law which actually mentioned 'things strangled' (*suffocatis*). Thus there is no possibility of alleging the dislike of a food law as a motive for the change of text. Finally, it is difficult to suppose that any scribe of Acts in the second century *deliberately* changed the obvious meaning of an important passage. No doubt the redactors of the Gospels treated their sources in this way—the evidence that they did so is overwhelming—but the scribes who copied the Gospels and Acts confined themselves to elucidating the meaning of the text. They made additions, alterations and omissions, but their intention was to explain, not to alter. No doubt they made many lamentable mistakes, but where is the evidence that they consciously set to work to change the manifest meaning of the text which they read? Whenever, therefore, we find a considerable variety of readings, we ought, if possible, to look for an original text offering some ambiguity which scribes would seek to clear up, first by notes in the margin, and afterwards by their insertion in the text.

Such a text would be excellently provided by the reading of Tertullian, which omits 'things strangled' but does not insert the golden rule.² This three-clause text presents just the ambiguity necessary to account for the early diversity both of text and of exegesis.

The first clause (*εἰδωλόθυστα*) means 'things offered to idols,' and may be as well taken in a narrow sense, a literal command not to eat that sort of food (which was

¹ The evidence is in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons.

² The insertion of the reference to the Spirit in the last clause seems to have no bearing on the question. Supposing it to be (as appears most probable) an insertion, it neither negatives nor affirms the other readings. To be 'carried along by the Holy Spirit' was a general characteristic of the Early Christians.

often sold in the market), as in the wider sense of a synonym for idolatry.¹ In the former case it is a food law, in the latter it is a moral or ethical rule. The next clause 'from blood' (αἵματος) is equally ambiguous, and was probably the cause of the later confusion. To anyone who had already interpreted the first clause in the sense of an ethical forbidding of idolatry it would naturally mean 'murder,'² but if the first clause were taken in the stricter sense of a literal command not to eat that sort of food, the second would naturally be interpreted as a reference to the Jewish objection to the use of blood as food. It is plain that the tendency of scribes would be to clear up this ambiguity, and in some way to indicate which interpretation was correct. Those who favoured the sense of a food law made it clear by adding 'things strangled'—first perhaps as a gloss in the margin, afterwards in the text itself—thus explaining blood as 'meat in which the blood had been retained,' 'sanguine suffocato' as the Vulgate (in some MSS.) puts it.³ Those, on

¹ 1 Cor. x. is an instructive commentary on the word. It is the answer of St. Paul to the question of the Corinthians περὶ εἰδωλοθύτων. In the first half (vv. 14–22) of the answer to eat εἰδωλόθυστα is treated as an act of idolatry,—the actual sacrifice to a false god, and is forbidden: in the second half (vv. 23–33) it is treated in the sense merely of eating food which, after having been used in sacrifice, was sold in the shops and used for an ordinary meal; this is in principle allowed, though St. Paul makes practical reservations because of the chance of giving offence to the weaker brethren. It is clear that in this chapter St. Paul is either deliberately ignoring the Apostolic decrees, or interpreting them as forbidding idolatry, not as establishing a food law. Cf. Resch, *Aposteldecret*, p. 21.

² Probably few will doubt that αἷμα can be used in the sense of murder—blood guiltiness—but G. Resch has met any such objection by a convincing list of quotations in his *Aposteldecret*, p. 42.

The passages he quotes are:—Lev. xvii. 4; Num. xxxv. 27; Sir. xxxiv. 25; St. Matt. xxiii. 30; Apoc. vi. 10; Demosthenes, *In Meidiam*, 548; Pausanias, v. 1, 6; Aeschylus, *Eumen.* 302; Plato, *Laws*, 872 DE, and others of less importance.

³ It is significant also that Origen (Mt. ii. 837), though he seems to have known the ordinary four-clause text, also quotes the decrees in a three-clause form with πνικτοῦ instead of αἵματος. Methodius too has the same curious text. This may be a slip, or may be an instance of the gloss replacing the word glossed.

the other hand, who regarded the decrees as a moral law made their meaning plain by adding the negative form of the golden rule. It is possible that the addition of the reference to the Spirit was made at the same time, and for the same purpose, but the evidence of Tertullian (who has it, but has not yet adopted the golden rule) suggests that it is an earlier interpolation, and probably has nothing to do with the addition of the golden rule, or the omission of 'things strangled,' but is merely one of the edifying remarks which the early scribes loved, and sometimes allowed into the text.

Each of these two ways of altering the text rendered the meaning unmistakeable,—that is exactly the reason why neither can be original. But the short three-clause text used by Tertullian is ambiguous, adequately explains the origin of both readings, and is implicitly borne witness to by both of them. It would no doubt be foolish to claim that the textual question can be solved with certainty: there must be an element of doubt in a text on which second-century evidence—two hundred years before our best MSS.—was sharply divided, but reflection is likely to convince all who concede (what becomes every year a more and more widely held opinion) that our most famous uncials only represent an Alexandrian recension of the third or fourth century, that the argument on purely textual grounds is against the four-clause text, and in favour of the shorter form.

To the textual argument can be added a far stronger historical argument to shew that the Apostolic decrees were originally of the nature of moral requirements rather than a food law. This historical argument is contained in the answers given to the questions, Which is really more likely to have been the decision of the council? Which is most consistent with the subsequent course of events? Which is most probably implied by the Pauline epistles?

Taking the two last questions first, the superiority of the three-clause form of the decree is as follows: (1) It removes the obvious difficulties of the sudden association of a food law with fornication. (2) The absolute silence of St. Paul on the decrees in 1 Cor. x. when he is discussing 'things

offered to idols,' and in Rom. xiv. when he is discussing food in general, is almost unintelligible if we suppose that the decrees were a food law. Even more difficult is the statement in Gal. ii. 6 that the Jerusalem Apostles added nothing (οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο) to St. Paul,—that is to say, made no additions to his gospel. If we suppose¹ that Gal. ii. refers to the Apostolic council, and that the council enacted a food law, it would be hard for St. Paul to say that the Apostles had made no additions to his gospel: for it is plain from all his epistles that a food law was widely removed from his thoughts. On the other hand, if the decrees were a moral requirement to abstain from idolatry, murder and fornication, it would be quite true. There is no evidence that St. Paul ever condoned these offences, or needed an Apostolic decree to persuade him to require his converts to abstain from them. Finally, there is no more evidence outside the Pauline epistles, whether in the Acts or elsewhere, that there was any controversy as to a food law after the council than there is that it was the subject of discussion before it.

The remaining question—which form of decree is in itself more likely to have been adopted by the council?—is more difficult to answer, but again there is a decided balance of argument in favour of the three-clause text. Generally speaking, commentators have been inclined to argue that a food law is a probable decree, because the Jews placed so much importance on such regulations. It is probably true that this argument is partly based on the very unfair attitude which so many Christian theologians have adopted towards Jewish religion—always emphasizing the ritual and legalist elements in it, and ignoring the ethical and religious basis. Still, when all possible allowance has been made for this

¹ Personally the present writer does not do so, but in deference to a widely spread opinion he adopts the view for the moment. While agreeing with almost every word of the article by Mr. Emmet in the *Expositor* (March, 1910) on the date of Galatians, he cannot agree that the three-clause form of the decree gives him an argument,—but Mr. Emmet can afford to spare some from his superabundance.

factor, it remains true that the outward side of religious life had great importance for the Jews of the first century. So much must be admitted. But when one goes on to ask for proof that 'things strangled' were a point on which the Jewish element in the Christian Church at Jerusalem would probably have laid stress, it is simply not forthcoming. There is no evidence earlier than the fifth century after Christ that the Jews regarded the command not to eat blood as meaning more than that they were not to collect and use for cooking blood which was shed in the act of slaughtering an animal.¹ Even if we concede that in some circles the Jews had this custom in the first century, and that this is the origin of the later Christian practice, it is at least obvious that this rule was not likely to have been so crucial a point at the Jerusalem council, that the Jewish party would have given way on the question of circumcision, but have held firm on the question of extracting blood from slaughtered animals. Moreover, the suggestion which is sometimes made that the Apostolic decrees correspond to the so-called Noachic regulations which, on the basis of Gen. ix. 4, were supposed to be binding on Gentiles living in Palestine, is unfortunately negatived by a comparison of the seven Noachic commands with the Apostolic decrees. The seven commands² were: (1) Against false gods, (2) against blasphemy, (3) against shedding of blood, (4) against robbery, (5) on obedience to the magistrates, (6) on covering the naked, (7) against cutting flesh from a living animal. It is also said³ that the last of these commands is a later addition. It is clear that there is here, if anything, a closer

¹ Once more reference must be made to Resch, who collects all the evidence (*Das Aposteldecret*, pp. 21 ff.). It would seem that the present Jewish custom of extracting all blood from meat (the 'Kosher' or 'pure' meat) can be traced back to the tractate *Chollin* of the fifth or sixth century, and is not mentioned in any earlier books. The matter is, of course, one on which only Rabbinical scholars have a right to speak, but it does not appear that Resch's view is seriously disputed by them.

² *Sanhedrin*, 56b.; cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (fourth edition), p. 178, note 77 (3rd. ed. p. 128).

³ By Hamburger, *Realencyclopaedie*, s. v. *Noachiden*.

resemblance to the three-clause than to the four-clause form of the Apostolic decrees.¹

Thus there is no reason to think that the Jewish feeling of the first century would have been inclined to accept a food law as the basis of a compromise with the Antiochene movement. On the other hand, it is undeniable that the evidence of the advice given to King Izates, the tradition of Rabbi Joshua (see above, p. 350) and the fourth book of the Sibyllines, is the proof that the requirement of the moral law alone would have been nothing strange in the history of Judaism. Moreover, a comparison of the text of the Sibyllines raises the question whether the actual formula of the three-clause text of Acts xv. does not go back to some Jewish form of which there is also a trace in the Oracles.²

¹ The fact probably is that the Noachian rules are a later crystallization of the primarily moral requirements of the early Jewish Propaganda in the Diaspora.

² The two passages which are important are as follows :

(1) *Or. Sib.* iv. 24-33 :

ὄλβιοι ἀνθρώπων κείνοι κατὰ γαίαν ἔσονται,
ὅσσοι δὴ στέρξουσι μέγαν θεὸν εὐλογέοντες
πρὶν πιεῖν φαγέειν τε πεποιθότες εὖσεβήσιν·
οἱ νηοὺς μὲν ἀπαντας ἀπαρνήσονται ἰδόντες
καὶ βωμούς, εἰκαῖα λίθων ἀφιδρύματα κωφῶν,
αἵμασιν ἐμψύχων μεμιασμένα καὶ θυσίησιν
τετραπόδων· λεύσουσι δ' ἐνὸς θεοῦ εἰς μέγα κῦδος
οὔτε φόνον ῥέξαντες ἀτάσθαλον οὔτε κλοπαίον
κέρδος ἀπεμπολέοντες, ἃ δὴ ῥίγιστα τέτυκται,
οὐδ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίῃ κοίτῃ πόθον αἰσχρὸν ἔχοντες
οὐδὲ ἐπ' ἄρσενος ὕβριν ἀπεχθεά τε στυγερήν τε.

Geffcken rejects the last line, which is not found in the Ω recension. But it is doubtful whether this is sufficient reason.

(2) *Or. Sib.* iv. 162-170 :

ἃ μέλεις, μετᾶθεσθε, βροτοί, τάδε, μηδὲ πρὸς ὀργήν
παντοίην ἀγάγητε θεὸν μέγαν, ἀλλὰ μεθέντες
φάσγανα καὶ στοναχὰς ἀνδροκτασίας τε καὶ ὕβρεις
ἐν ποταμοῖς λούσασθε ὄλον δέμας ἀενάοισιν,
χεῖράς τ' ἐκτανύσαντες ἐς αἰθέρα τῶν πάρος ἔργων
συγγνώμην αἰτεῖσθε καὶ εὐλογίαις ἀσέβειαν
πικρὰν ἰλάσκεσθε· θεὸς δώσει μετάνοιαν
οὐδ' ὀλέσει· παύσει δὲ χόλον πάλιν, ἥνπερ ἅπαντες
εὖσεβὴν περίτιμον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἀσκήσητε.

It is surely very remarkable that here as in the Apostolic decrees, if the three-clause text be followed, abstinence from idolatry, blood-shedding and immorality¹ should be selected as the characteristics of a good life. It is very unlikely that there is any literary connexion between the Oracles and the Acts, and the probable suggestion seems to be that both are to be traced back to antecedent Jewish expression.

So far, therefore, there is a decided balance of argument in favour of the three-clause form of the Apostolic decrees. The one argument which at first seems seriously to weigh against it on historical grounds is the existence at the end of the second century in the Christian Church of a food law which certainly did refer to meat with the blood in it. The earliest evidence for this is probably the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (in 178), in which Biblis, one of the martyrs, is stated to have refuted the accusation of cannibalism by saying, 'Those who are not allowed to eat the blood of irrational animals, how should they eat children?'² A little later, in his *Apology*³ and elsewhere, Tertullian refers to the food law of the Christians as commanding them to abstain from 'suffocatis,' and Clement of Alexandria⁴ also bears witness to the same practice. This seems certainly a strong evidence that 'things strangled' were forbidden by a Christian food law. But it is weakened to unimportance for the present purpose by the fact that none of these writers except Clement connect the custom with the Apostolic decrees. For Irenaeus, who, even if not the writer of the letter of Lyons and Vienne, was the bearer of the letter to

¹ It is highly probable that *ὄβρις* in l. 164 has a sexual significance (cf. l. 33).

² Eus. *H. E.* V. 1. 26 (ed. Schwartz, p. 412). The Latin of Rufinus has 'flesh' instead of blood, but the Greek is probably right.

³ 'Erubescat error vester Christianis, qui ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculentis habemus, qui propterea suffocatis quoque et morticinis abstinemus, ne quo modo sanguine contamine-mur vel intra viscera sepulto.' *Apol.* 9; cf. also *de Monogam.* 5; *de Jejun.* 4 and 15; *de Spect.* 13; and see Resch, *op. cit.* p. 148, where these passages are collected.

⁴ *Paed.* 2, 7; *Strom.* 4, 15.

Rome,¹ and was afterwards bishop of Lyons, used the three-clause text of the decrees, and Tertullian not only used the three-clause text, but explained it as a reference to the three deadly sins. Moreover, writers earlier than the end of the second century say nothing of any food law, mention 'things offered to idols' in the same way as St. Paul, as an incident in idolatry and communion with demons,² while the *Didache*³ knows so little of a food law that it says: 'Concerning food, bear what thou canst, but keep strictly from idol-sacrifice (εἰδωλοθύτου), for it is the service of dead gods.'

Thus, while there is evidence for a Christian food law before the end of the second century, it is not certain that it existed earlier, and it is in no case, except in Alexandria, connected with the Apostolic decrees.

Hence the evidence to be derived from the early Christian food law is really in favour of the three-clause text. The theory that the four-clause text is original, and referred to a food law, necessitates the hypothesis that it was altered to the three-clause form because a food law had become repugnant or obsolete. When we find, therefore, that the writers who quote the decrees as a moral requirement, nevertheless did possess exactly the food law which the four-clause form represents, and that it was neither obsolete nor offensive to them, we are debarred from accepting this hypothesis. There is clearly no reason whatever why they should have changed the decrees from a food law, if they had ever known them as such,—in other words, the three-clause form is presumably primitive, and the existence of the four-clause form is due to the reaction of the food law in Alexandria, first on the exegesis and afterwards on the text of the decrees. It is natural that this corruption should have taken place in Alexandria, because the text in that Church, although sometimes corrupt, escaped the great inundation of glosses—one might almost say commentary—which overwhelmed the text of Acts

¹ One copy went to Asia, another to Rome: cf. Harnack, *Die altchristliche Literatur*, p. 262, and *Chronologie*, pp. 315, 323.

² Aristides, *Apol.* 15; Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 35.

³ *Did.* 6.

elsewhere. It was therefore free from that addition of the golden rule, which, though textually corrupt, was exegetically not far from the truth, and protected the text elsewhere from the smaller but more pernicious gloss of 'things strangled,' which by so small an addition converted moral requirements into a food law.

There is one point more to be considered. So far it has been assumed that the choice must necessarily be between a food law and moral requirement illustrated by abstention from idolatry, murder, and fornication. Probably this is correct, but a few scholars¹ take a different position. They explain all the clauses of the decrees as references to various forms of idolatry. They have thus taken 'things strangled' as meaning sacrifices in which there was no shedding of blood. It is, however, obvious that the same exegesis could be applied to the three-clause text. The advantage of this line of interpretation is that it avoids the historical and critical difficulties connected with the view that the decrees were a food law, and this argument ought to weigh heavily with those who, on textual grounds, are reluctant to accept the three-clause text. The disadvantage is that there is no trace in early Christian literature that this interpretation was ever adopted. This objection is so serious that it renders it unlikely that this view will ever be widely adopted; but it should be noted that if it be taken, it does not affect the general view which has to be held of the position of the decrees in the Judaistic controversy. They still remain the concession by the Jerusalem party of the main contention of the Antiochene movement,—that converts ought to be admitted to Christianity without being compelled to observe the Jewish law as to circumcision and ritual observances. It was not a compromise, for in a compromise each party concedes something, and if the Apostolic decrees be not a food law, but moral requirements, the Antiochene party had conceded nothing,—to abstain from idolatry in any form, or from idolatry, murder, and fornication, was not a concession.

¹ The best statement of their case may be found in Professor H. Oort's article in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, No. 40, pp. 97 ff.

We ought thus to regard the result of the Apostolic council as the decision of the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem to admit the contention of the Antiochene movement to accept Gentile converts to Christianity without the condition of observing the Jewish law. It was not a compromise, it was a triumph—a triumph of the most far-reaching consequences both for Christianity and for Judaism. For the success of Christianity and the failure of Judaism in their attempts to conquer the Roman Empire largely depended on it. Christianity had been originally a part of Judaism, and in selecting a method for carrying its propaganda among the Gentiles it had, along with the other sects of Judaism, to choose between the liberal spirit of the Diaspora—represented by Antioch—and the strictness of the dominant school of Jerusalem. Christianity at the council of Jerusalem chose aright. Official Judaism, both then and after the fall of Jerusalem, chose wrongly, for though the Sibylline Oracles bear witness to the survival of the broader spirit in Judaism, it was only found in a small minority, never became typically Jewish, and soon disappeared, just as, on the other hand, the narrower spirit survived in some parts of Jewish Christianity, but never became dominant, and ultimately died out. The result was that Christianity gained all those of the Graeco-Roman world who had felt the attraction of Jewish monotheism, Jewish ethics, and Jewish eschatological hope, while Judaism failed to hold them.

From the moment of the Apostolic council, and the triumph of Antioch, this result was inevitable ; but in such a struggle the minority is defeated without being either convinced or destroyed. There doubtless remained a party which continued to unite Christian propaganda with a strict adhesion to the Jewish law, and regarded the council as a lamentable mistake. Moreover, it is obvious that the Jews would regard this new development of Christianity with increased dislike ; for it was no longer merely the identification of the Messiah with Jesus, but a definite denial of the universal validity of the Jewish law and cultus—the participation by the Christians, already heretical enough, in the dangerous latitudinarianism which Ananias

had so lamentably suggested to Izates, and the Jews of the Dispersion had occasionally been so weak as to encourage.

The inevitable result, therefore, was that the Jerusalem propaganda continued among Christians, though now rather as a protesting and reactionary conservatism, and that the opposition of the Jews to Christianity was strengthened and embittered. The effect of these phenomena can be seen in the events of St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem,¹ and in varying degrees in the Pauline epistles, though only two of them are directly or chiefly concerned with the question.

On the occasion of St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, St. James, while reaffirming his acceptance of the Apostolic decrees, emphasized the existence of 'many myriads' of Christian Jews, all zealous for the law, and fearing that St. Paul was not content with absolving the heathen who became Christians from the obligation of the law, but was also teaching the Jews that it was no longer binding on them and their children. It is for our purpose immaterial whether this be accepted as really an utterance of St. James, or as representing St. Luke's idea of the attitude of the Jewish Christians and of their leader. In either case it is good evidence of the Jewish Christians' position, and of their attitude towards St. Paul and the Antiochene movement generally. Equally instructive is St. Paul's conduct: he at once agreed to shew by his actions that he recognized the validity of the law for Jews. It is of course possible to argue that in doing this St. Paul was inconsistent with his teaching: probably many of the Jewish Christians honestly believed that the direct result of his writing and preaching must be the abandonment of the law even by Jews; possibly some of his converts had really drawn this conclusion, and one might even maintain that they were logical in doing so, for history has certainly justified them. But teachers are not always entirely logical or consistent, and, even if the

¹ It is possible that there was a visit to Jerusalem between this and the Apostolic council. Acts xviii. 22 is often interpreted in this sense; but in any case this must have been a flying visit, and is unimportant for the present question.

fullest weight be given to this argument, it does not in the least shew that the account in Acts is untrustworthy.

We have then to recognize the probability that at the time of St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem the position was as follows: The Antiochene movement had triumphed, and been recognized by the leaders of the Jewish Christians as legitimate. In the hands of St. Paul this meant that circumcision and the law were not demanded from Gentile converts, but were recognized as binding on Jewish Christians, but it is probable that some of St. Paul's adherents already pushed his principles to their logical conclusion and denied that circumcision and the law were binding on anyone.¹ Over against this extreme Gentile position was that of the mass of Jewish Christians who were zealous for the law, identified St. Paul with the extreme position of some of his followers, and probably regarded the Apostolic decrees as a dangerous concession, which they never accepted *ex animo*.

The attitude of the non-Christian Jews is equally well shewn by the Pauline epistles and by the Acts. According to these St. Paul's most determined enemies were the Jews. In Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia Jewish hostility was strong and irreconcilable, and in Jerusalem it was the direct cause of his imprisonment. It is clear that the Jews in the capital tolerated St. James and his party, even though

¹ No doubt this question was connected with a certain vagueness as to whether it were strictly accurate to say that the Messiah was already come or not. The original position was no doubt that Jesus was the Messiah, but it was equally clearly held that He had not yet come as Messiah. The Parousia—which means 'coming,' not 'return'—was still future, and the Messianic kingdom did not yet exist except in a certain proleptic sense. But until the Messiah came—not until it was known who he was—the law was binding. This was probably the original position, so far as it was consciously thought out at all, but almost from the first among Gentile Christians the 'proleptic' element began to be forgotten, more and more importance to be given to the actual work of Jesus, His life to be regarded as really a 'coming' of the Messiah, and the kingdom as already existent. With such a position, the law naturally seemed to be entirely superseded,

their toleration was tempered with contempt and dislike : after all,—they seem to have argued—though these people have foolish ideas as to the identity of the Messiah, they nevertheless observe the law, and are otherwise orthodox. But for St. Paul nothing was bad enough, he was a renegade and a traitor, and as such worthy of death.

Moreover, this Jewish hatred of St. Paul, though based on doctrinal differences, was undoubtedly inflamed by the fact that the success of the Christian mission was largely due to the careful work of the synagogue, which had attracted large numbers of Gentiles and hoped to make converts of them. It was chiefly from this class that the Christian preachers made their converts, and the Jews could not be expected to regard with equanimity the sight of heretics successfully reaping the harvest which the orthodox had sown. This class of Gentiles was that known as the God fearers.¹ They were Gentiles who had become interested in Judaism, and welcomed some of the Jewish doctrines, without being prepared to accept circumcision,² and there are many references to them in literature and in inscriptions. Josephus, for instance, speaks of Gentiles who have accepted

¹ They are referred to in the New Testament in the following places :—as 'φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν' in Acts x. 2, 22, 35 ; xiii. 16, 26 ; as 'σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν,' Acts xvi. 14 ; xviii. 27 ; as 'σεβόμενοι' in Acts xiii. 50 ; xvii. 4, 17, and as 'σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι' in Acts xiii. 43. It was formerly regarded as probable that this class ought to be regarded as proselytes in the strict sense, and Deyling in his *Observationes sacrae*, followed by almost all other scholars, identified them with the 'Proselytes of the Gate' mentioned in the Talmud. Schürer, however (who up till then had followed Deyling), shewed in the third edition of his *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, iii. pp. 124 ff.—(N.B. the English translation is from the second edition, and out of date on this point)—that this view was untenable. 'Proselyte of the Gate' is a purely mediaeval term ; its meaning is doubtful, but is probably 'Gentiles living among Jews.'

² Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, 1896 (esp. pp. 295 ff.), does not deny the existence of the class, but does not identify them with the 'God fearers,' whom he regards as the same as proselytes. He seems to be decisively answered by Schürer, and by Lévi (*Revue des études juives*, 1905).

the Jewish law, and says that no country has escaped the influence of Judaism, especially with regard to the Sabbath.¹ Tertullian² mentions the same fact, and Juvenal³ gives a remarkable picture—obviously drawn from life—of the danger, from his point of view, of this class of Judaically-minded persons; the father, he says, only takes a few of the Jewish customs—he observes the Sabbath, and accepts monotheism—but the children are completely captured by the synagogue, and hesitate even to shew the way in the street to those who have a different creed. Moreover, inscriptional evidence, fully given by Schürer,⁴ shews that the class was widespread and more or less (varying in different places) related to the synagogue.⁵

Thus the Christian missionaries found ready to their hand a large class of 'God fearers' standing at various distances from the synagogue, and no doubt privately making every possible sort of combination of Greek, Roman, Jewish and other Oriental religions. Nor is it difficult to understand that this circle of 'God fearers' were the most promising field for Christian missionaries. The 'God fearers' had already accepted two of the cardinal features of Christian preaching—monotheism, and the eschatological expectation of judgement. It is practically certain that this must have implied some sort of Messianic belief, varying in definiteness no doubt in different districts. They started, therefore, with much the same point of view as Christians: still more with the same point of view as the disciples of John the Baptist. All that the Christian teacher had to do was to persuade his hearers that the Messiah, whose coming to carry out the judgement of God

¹ Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, ii. 123, 282 ff.

² *Ad Nationes*, i. 13.

³ *Sat.* xiv. 96-106.

⁴ *Op. cit.* (3rd edit.) iii. p. 123 note, and still more fully in the 4th edit. iii. p. 174 note.

⁵ A later offshoot of it was the *ὑψιστάριοι*, the *θεοσεβείς*, and similar classes. Important for this purpose are Schürer *Die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche, und die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὑψιστον* ebendasselbst in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Prussian Academy for 1897, and V. Cumont's *Hypsistos*, in *Suppl. à la Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, 1897.

was so confidently expected,¹ could be identified with Jesus, and that (since, although from the point of view of function He became Messiah through the Resurrection and would 'come' speedily in that capacity, He had nevertheless from the beginning, from the point of view of personality, always been Messiah) His teaching must therefore be accepted as Messianic, and Baptism in His Name was Baptism to the hitherto nameless Messiah.

If these facts be taken into consideration, the character and the success of the Christian propaganda among the 'God fearers' is as intelligible as is the indignation of the Jews. The latter had gradually collected round the synagogue a circle of 'God fearers,' from which they constantly drew the true proselytes who accepted circumcision and were absorbed into Judaism: human nature could scarcely be expected to tolerate the rapid passing over of expected converts from the ranks of the 'God fearers' to those of the Christians. It is, moreover, sufficiently plain that this result was largely due to the fateful decision of the Apostolic council, and we can understand how rightly St. Luke regarded it as a turning point in the history of the Early Church. But, it must be added, the plainness of this fact is greatly reduced if we accept the text of Acts xv., which represents the decision as a compromise and as a food law.

To sum up: It would be a mistake to regard the council at Jerusalem as the end of the Judaistic controversy; but it was the turning point, for what it did was to make the position of the Antiochene movement secure, and to pave the way for making it the dominant section of Christianity. The controversy itself remained for many years, but it was no longer so important, and it took a somewhat different form.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

¹ The ethics and theology of the Christians were, except on this point of the identification of the Messiah, not essentially different from those which the Jewish propaganda (and so far as ethics go, perhaps also the Stoics) had already instilled into the minds of the God-fearers.

ART. VI.—LOMBARDIC ARCHITECTURE.

1. *Le Origini della Architettura Lombarda e delle sue principali derivazioni nei paesi d'oltr' alpe.* By G. T. RIVOIRA. Two Volumes. (Roma : Hermann Loescher and Co. 1901, 1907.) Second edition. (Milan : Hoepli. 1908.)
2. *The Arts in Early England.* By G. BALDWIN BROWN, Watson-Gordon Professor of Fine Art in the University of Edinburgh. Vol. II. *Ecclesiastical Architecture in England from the Conversion of the Saxons to the Norman Conquest.* (London : John Murray. 1903.)
3. *The Beginnings of Gothic Architecture.* By JOHN BILSON. 'Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects.' Third Series. Vol. VI. (London. 1899.)
4. *Lombardic Architecture. Its Origin, Development and Derivatives.* By G. T. RIVOIRA. Translated by G. McN. RUSHFORTH. Two Volumes. (London : William Heinemann. 1910.)

THE first Director of the British School of Archaeology at Rome has earned the gratitude of all lovers of architecture by his labour in translating Signor Rivoira's work, which in its Italian form was probably known to few. It is an ambitious and in many ways great work, which covers a field of which most people are only familiar with very limited portions. It will certainly, as its author prophesies, 'arouse criticism,' but that is the essential of all progress, and if his confidence as to the truth of all his views is stated somewhat dogmatically, few people are so much entitled to dogmatize as he. For he combines various qualifications. In the first place he is an architect. Secondly, he has a wide knowledge of all available documentary evidence, and makes all possible use of it. Mr. Francis Bond has warned us against making too much of documents, but would doubtless not wish us to fall into the other extreme. Indeed he has said, that 'the millennium will not be reached in ecclesiology till archaeologists are architects and architects archaeologists.' Certainly Signor Rivoira is

both. And thirdly, he has travelled widely, and, as he tells us, spent 'twenty years of research and study extending over some thousand buildings scattered over the ancient Roman world.' Not the least pleasant feature to us is the attention that he has devoted to pre-Conquest buildings in England, and with that part of his subject this article will largely deal, as naturally there is not so much scope for originality when he deals with the English cathedrals and churches of the post-Conquest period.

Mr. Rushforth has done his work excellently, having had the advantage throughout of the personal supervision of the author, who has settled the terminology employed. Whether English writers will follow his example and talk of *lesenas*, *pulvins* and *raccords*, matters little. In any case the writer's meaning is always perfectly clear. Occasionally some sentences need mending.¹ But generally speaking, though we should prefer to be without such metaphors as 'mists of prejudice,' or 'the flickering light of an aurora borealis,' there is little to complain of in the style of the work. One exasperating feature of it—deliberate, we understand—is the insufficient references to literature in the footnotes. Except in the case of the arch-opponent Strzygowski, Signor Rivoira hardly ever mentions the names of those whose opinions he controverts in the text, but simply refers to the titles of their works in footnotes. It causes the reader needless trouble to be simply referred to Dehio or Jackson *op. cit.*, and the contrast with an ordinary German scientific work is startling. There is such a thing as overloading footnotes, and, after all, what Signor Rivoira thinks is what we want to know in the first instance; but he need not make it so unnecessarily difficult to find out what other people think on the same subject. He need not give the quite erroneous impression that his feelings might be expressed in the words, *Pereant qui ante nos nostra*

¹ As *e.g.* vol. i. p. 50, line 7; vol. i. p. 223, line 20; vol. ii. p. 177 (top); and something has gone wrong, vol. ii. p. 135, where Wilfrid is described as peace-loving; and on p. 206 of vol. i., if both the church of Sta. Prassede and the Chapel of St. Zeno are the work of Pope Paschal I, the capitals can hardly be of the eleventh century.

dixerunt. Moreover, he is quite entitled to emphasize the independence of his own work and conclusions. Thus he tells us he arrived at his present views about Durham Cathedral in 1896. He might have indicated his general agreement with Mr. John Bilson, who in 1899 published a convincing demonstration on the same side; and if Canon Greenwell defended the same view in 1879, it is rather curious to say that he merely 'foreshadowed' the result, which the author now sets forth to his readers. Yet we are not going to find fault with the work in the least because there is a good deal of the 'ego' in it; that is quite inevitable; but we shall indicate presently where we think that the author shews the defects of his qualities.

The arrangement of the books is simplicity itself, so far as treatment is concerned. Thus, Volume I has five chapters. The first deals with what the author calls the Romano-Ravennate and Byzantino-Ravennate styles from 395-774. The second is entitled the Comacine Masters. The third deals with the pre-Lombardic style from 583-774, and the fourth with architecture in Italy and Dalmatia in the age of Charlemagne. The fifth deals with the subsequent development into the complete Lombardic style, which he puts at about 1120. The name Lombardic architecture is firmly established. Signor Rivoira naturally adheres to it, because in his opinion the districts of Como and Milan were of primary importance in the development of architecture in Italy. Nevertheless, it is most extraordinarily perplexing to the lay mind to find that the architecture of the Lombard kingdom of Italy is called pre-Lombardic, and that Lombardic architecture proper does not begin till near 1000 A.D., when the Lombard kingdom was a thing of the distant past. Nor can we see why Signor Rivoira dislikes the name Romanesque, seeing that the great feature of his book is to exhibit the debt which all later builders either did owe or might have owed to Roman methods of construction and constructive achievements. His objection apparently is, that one might as well call the Byzantine style Romanesque, as its debt was equally great to the buildings of Rome. In fact, he

really objects to the term Byzantine altogether, because he is unwilling to believe in a survival of the Hellenic traditions. No one ought to deny the influence of Roman buildings on Constantinople and the East, but it is equally impossible to deny that in Greece and Asia Minor Rome met the old Hellenic traditions, and the fusion of the streams created something fresh, which deserves a new name. We shall endeavour to do full justice to Signor Rivoira's work in setting forth the great achievements of ancient Rome and their effect, whether actual or potential, on later architecture. It was only to be expected that some one would vindicate this place for Rome in architecture, just as Wickhoff and Mrs. Arthur Strong have been claiming originality for Rome in sculpture. But we can hardly feel that the author either has fully studied or fully does justice to the contribution of Asia Minor to the architecture of the Empire. It is no doubt interesting to hear that Anthemius of Tralles had a brother Alexander practising as a physician at Rome, but even apart from that it would have been very surprising if he never visited Rome in the course of his studies. But if he went to Rome—as no doubt he did—he only superadded new inspirations to the Hellenic training he had already received. There were besides great *thermae* at Constantinople and Ephesus to study and to learn from. It is a distinct proof that Ionia was a centre of art, when we find an architect of Tralles associated with one of Miletus to produce the *chef-d'œuvre* of the new capital, and a younger Isidorus to follow them. Moreover, when we read the extraordinarily suggestive chapter on the Octagon in architecture in Strzygowski's *Kleinasien*, with its literary support in Gregory of Nyssa's description of his octagonal church, we can only agree with Mr. Henderson,¹ that the architect of SS. Sergius and Bacchus came from Ionia too. Signor Rivoira's attempt to take away from Constantinople and Asia Minor the palm of priority and award it to Macedonia and Salonica has really little plausibility in it, since he regards even Salonica as only the disciple of Ravenna. There is really too much complication in the Roman Empire

¹ *The Builder*, January 6, 1906.

at this time for it to be at all likely that everything sprang from one parent stem. Nor can it be supposed that Greece was dead : in fact it is alive still. It would therefore in our opinion be incorrect to call the Byzantine style Romanesque, while it would not be improper to call it Romano-Byzantine.

The second volume deals in Chapter I with the Lombardo-Norman style in Burgundy ; in Chapter II with it in Normandy ; in Chapter III with pre-Conquest architecture in England ; in Chapter IV with the Lombardo-Norman style in England ; in Chapter V with Ireland ; in Chapter VI with earlier architecture in Germany, and in Chapter VII with the Lombardo-Rhenish style. These appellations seem thoroughly just and proper. The author has thus nearly covered the whole field, but not quite. He does not seem familiar with Western Hungary. It would be interesting if at some future date he treated of such splendid specimens of Romanesque as the ruined abbey of Zsámbélk, the cathedral of Pecs (Fünfkirchen) with its four towers at the angles, the church of Lébeny with its western helmed towers, or the lath church of Bény. He does indeed mention the abbey church of Jak near Szombathely, but apparently not from personal acquaintance. Mr. T. G. Jackson sees French influence in Western Hungary. As the country only became Christianized about 1000, it is not likely that any of the dates would compete with churches known to Signor Rivoira. Completeness would be attained if there were added a short treatment of the Scandinavian monuments of this style, the cathedrals of Lund, Ribe and Viborg, which date from the first half of the twelfth century, not to mention numerous parish churches in Denmark of the greatest interest.¹ Perhaps the chapter on Ireland, which is too brief to be of much service, and the chief object of which seems to be to deprecate, through the later dating of all the monuments, any idea of a stream of art coming from this direction, might be omitted in a later edition in favour of one on Scandinavia.

Before we pass on to the book, a word may be said about

¹ See *Udsigt over Danmarks Kirkebygninger fra den tidligere Middelalder (den Romanske periode)* ap J. B. Løffler. Kjøbenhavn, 1883.

the arrangement. Width of illustration is a feature—and a very good feature—of the book; but occasionally this leads to much discursiveness. The English edition no longer contains illustrations of remains in Mashonaland, but it still deals with a very wide field. We pass from Rome to Firuz-Abad and back to France in a way which is sometimes bewildering. In the middle of the discussion of St. Bénigne at Dijon, the author carries us off to the Holy Sepulchre, takes us to various sites in the Holy Land, but does not allow us to return to Dijon till we have discussed a church at Spoleto. We leave Hexham suddenly for the galleried basilicas of Rome, because Wilfrid must have seen them and taken them as his models. A good deal of the matter of the book would be read more easily in excursions. Thus in Volume I it would be better to have excursions on (1) the churches of Salonica; (2) the date and development of bell-towers; (3) stylophorous animals; (4) Persian architecture; (5) Byzantine domes; (6) the difference between Eastern and Western relief styles: in Volume II on (1) the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, etc.; (2) the 'Temple of the Clitumnus'; (3) Hadrian as an architect. One reads and re-reads these sections as they occur, without fully taking them in. The other arrangement would really facilitate comprehension.¹

We advise all who can to examine the Italian edition. It contained a number of very fine full-page plates, which have found no place in the English edition. In particular, the frontispiece to Volume I, the interior of San Vitale, and that of Volume II, Durham Cathedral, will be missed. Some of these plates are really needed, *e.g.* Plate II, the façade of the church of San Pietro at Toscanella, is certainly wanted, also the side view (fig. 235 in the Italian edition) and the left doorway. Similarly, Plates III and V of the Duomo of Zara and the interior of San Ambrogio are much to be desired. The palace of Diocletian at Spalato is still

¹ While not desiring to controvert the view that bell-towers are late, we are a good deal troubled how to explain the view of two towers on the door of Sta. Sabina (fifth or sixth century), and de Rossi's authority troubles us more than it does Signor Rivoira!

further neglected in the English edition as being quite unoriginal, but there was at least one illustration of it in the Italian edition. The interesting Chronological Index has been dropped, which is a pity, and there are various minor omissions. Apparently the author no longer thinks that the plan of SS. Cosma and Damiano at Rome had any influence on the plan of San Vitale; if so, we agree with him. Apart from the matter mentioned by the translator as new, most highly important sections have been added to the English edition on the Basilica Ursiana at Ravenna and on the cathedral of Aversa.

Now it is high time to come to the matter of the book, and the first thing that must be said about the opening chapter is that one naturally asks where the Byzantino-Ravennate style comes in at all. The thesis of the chapter is that Constantinople did not affect Ravenna at all, except by sending some ready-carved columns and capitals. San Vitale was practically finished before Justinian had anything to do with it: the emperor's part was apparently chiefly to pay the bill! Julianus Argentarius, an Italian, was the architect of San Vitale, S. Apollinare in Classe (this much we must grant), of S. Lorenzo Maggiore at Milan, of the cathedral of Parenzo in Istria, and practically of SS. Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople, for (p. 60) the plans of San Vitale 'were known to the architect of Justinian's building.' This is quick work! San Vitale was begun in 526 and not consecrated till 547. SS. Sergius and Bacchus was begun about 527, and no doubt did not take a quarter of the time to build that San Vitale did. If the plans of both were made in Constantinople this is possible, but hardly otherwise. Moreover, the Eastern church seems to be an experiment in building, highly irregular in plan, and not really much influenced by any extant building¹ for the details of its construction. Signor Rivoira records the fact that the church of San Vitale was begun on the return of Archbishop Ecclesius from Constantinople. Was that visit without any influence upon the plans and preparations for San Vitale? In 525 Justinian as heir-apparent may have

¹ See Mr. Henderson's article in *The Builder*.

already been dreaming of the recovery of Ravenna which he actually accomplished in 539. The cathedral of Parenzo, we are told, was erected by Bishop Euphrasius between 535 and 543. Was the reincorporation of Italy in the Empire without any bearing on this fact? Istria remained part of the Exarchate even after the establishment of the Lombard kingdom. It is inherently improbable that Byzantine influence was limited to the export of columns; but if this was so, the name Byzantino-Ravennate is meaningless and should be dropped.

We turn next to deal with the interesting observations of the author on the early cathedral of Ravenna, the basilica of Archbishop Ursus, which seems to belong to the end of the fourth century and of which plans and drawings appear to be preserved. The author claims for it five original features as the creations of the school of Ravenna and not of Constantinople. First it is, he says, the oldest instance of a church with the apse at the east end. Later on we find that he regards the church of San Salvatore at Spoleto and the Temple of the Clitumnus, which have eastern sanctuaries, as earlier, but in their case it was only topographical reasons that led to this arrangement. So important a change could hardly be brought about by a difficulty of the site. But it is impossible to state dogmatically what church ushered in the new arrangement. It is extremely interesting to find that the cathedral of Ravenna had it, but it is a *petitio principii* in the present state of our knowledge to argue that it was the first. Secondly, Signor Rivoira claims this as the first example of an apse curvilinear internally and polygonal externally. This is at least highly questionable. At Sillyon in Pamphylia is a very early Christian church formed by utilizing a Hellenistic wall for one of its sides. This has a projecting apse, curvilinear internally and triangular externally, and it is safe to assume that it is earlier in date than the Basilica Ursiana. Side has an apse with a triangular exterior. In at least seven of the Asiatic churches described by Strzygowski, and many others described by Miss Gertrude Bell, the same feature occurs, shewing that it was a commonplace of early Christian architecture which might occur

anywhere.¹ Thirdly, the author claims the pulvins as a Ravennate creation, but admits they are a characteristic feature alike of the Ravennate and of the Byzantine style. The use of tapering tubes for vault construction is, as he points out, of Roman origin. Similarly in dealing with the basilica of San Giovanni, he is quite right in deriving from Roman buildings the plan of an apse flanked by rectangular sacristies in the axis of the aisles; but this was equally adopted in Asia Minor as well as in Italy. Who need trouble to ascertain which borrowed first, if it was a case of borrowing?

In fact, the chapter is consistently successful in claiming a Roman pattern for many of the features of later architecture, such as external buttresses *e.g.* to apses, terra-cotta tubes used constructively, blank arcading as decoration (the origin of triangular-headed arcading is better explained by figs. 28 and 29 than by fig. 428), double-splayed windows, domes in concave section unsupported by pendentives and precursors of actual pendentives. He is wise in not deciding how far the Roman builders got towards the pendentive; they certainly overcame some of the difficulties. But the basilica came to Rome in 154 B.C. from the Hellenistic East. It does not diminish the credit of the Roman architects in practically working out great problems, that they did not build simply on Etruscan foundations. Miss Bell's chapter on Ecclesiastical Architecture in Asia Minor² shews how extraordinarily varied were the plans of early Asiatic churches. Signor Rivoira is willing to allow that Eastern architects designed the palace-chapel at Aachen and the church of Germigny-des-Prés on account of their horse-shoe arches, which are abundant in Asia Minor³; but he is too hasty in assuming a Ravennate origin for many features that are also found in the East. If, for instance, the

¹ Signor Rivoira does not attempt to argue on these points. He simply states dogmatically that Strzygowski's dates for Binbirkilisse are wrong (vol. i. p. 47). Sir W. Ramsay and Miss Bell (*The Thousand and One Churches*, 1909) have now largely confirmed Strzygowski.

² *The Thousand and One Churches*, pp. 297-501.

³ *Ibid.*

early churches of Rome were lighted by clerestories, but those of Ravenna were also lighted from windows in the walls of apse and aisles, and the latter system is the prevalent one in early churches of Asia Minor, this suggests inevitably another stream of influence upon Ravenna. What is necessary is to make room for both sides in our theories. It is no longer possible to regard the brick decoration of walls with arched corbel courses and lesenas as appearing in the world for the first time in the mausoleum of Galla Placidia and the baptistery of Neon. Both in brick and stone such decoration seems to have been known in the East long before. The palace of Ctesiphon implies a long period of artistic evolution.¹

Chapter II has an important place in Signor Rivoira's work. The 'magistri Comacini' mentioned in the laws of the Lombard King Rotharis (636-652) and in the edict of Liutprand (712-744) are certainly master-masons. With many others he derives their name from the diocese of Como, and later on he speaks indifferently of Comacine or Lombard gilds as preparing the way for and causing the sudden bloom of Lombard architecture. The question is whether the epithet means 'native of Como.' In that case would one not have expected the form 'Comascini'? Moreover, the word is also spelt *Commacini* and *Cummacini*. If it refers to a locality at all, it might equally refer to the Comacchio north of Ravenna, and then Ravennate gilds would be shewn to exist at any rate till after the Exarchate passed into Lombard hands. This view is mentioned by Du Cange: but he is perhaps right in holding that the word means 'associated masons'²; and in that case these builders' gilds were not confined to any one district. As many of the buildings which Signor Rivoira makes most use of are in Southern Tuscany or Campania, really this view

¹ There is not space to discuss Signor Rivoira's interesting observations on the late date of elevated presbyteries. That of S. Apollinare in Classe (vol. i. p. 85) he holds to be a reconstruction of the twelfth century.

² Professor Baldwin Brown kindly tells the writer that this is his view.

would suit his researches best. We may quite allow that it is likely, that once formed they continued in existence till the eleventh century : and we must of course agree that it was Italy which lifted architecture once more out of the depth to heights previously unattained.

From the period covered in Chapter III we can hardly expect many monuments to survive. The church universally regarded as of this date, San Salvatore at Brescia, is treated rather cavalierly by Signor Rivoira, who says that it has been given an importance which it does not really possess. However, he makes amends by putting it as his frontispiece. On the other hand, he adds to the scanty list the parish church of Arliano near Lucca, the middle western door of which seems to him to prefigure the Lombardic portal, while its arched corbel courses with lesenas, double-played windows, round openings and luminous crosses suggest to him an eighth-century date. Much more interesting is the basilica of San Pietro at Toscanella, the eastern half of which he puts in the eighth century and is inclined to connect with a 'magister Comacinus' called Rodpertus, who sold land at this place in 739. It seems very probable that he is right. An interesting observation, which he makes *à propos* of this church, is that rose-windows did not make their appearance till about 1150 in church fronts. The latter part of the chapter, which strives to make a distinction between eastern and western relief carving of a very rough and ready kind, is not so convincing. It depends for its value on an assumption, which is probably quite baseless, *viz.* that the five slabs on the exterior of St. Eleutherios at Athens (commonly and incorrectly called the Small Metropolis) were taken from a 'Graeco-Egyptian temple close by, possibly dedicated to Serapis.' This has not a particle of probability. There are several other similar slabs in the National Museum, one figured by Bayet¹ of a lion devouring a sheep. The Serapeum must have been somewhere on the north slope of the Acropolis, but not necessarily very near : and if these slabs came from it, one must give up all hope of classifying early Christian decorative carving.

¹ *L'Art Byzantin*, p. 318.

The fourth chapter is chiefly interesting for its references to churches of the East. Signor Rivoira seems anxious to date all later Byzantine churches round the Church of the Virgin at Salonica (1028). He seems to ignore the building of the Nea by Basil I (881), and the effect it must have produced. He is anxious to vindicate priority for a 'Lombard cupola' as first seen in the baptistery of Galliano (1007),¹ and he is very unconvincing on St. Mary Panachrantos in Constantinople.² The tenth century must have witnessed a great development of church building in Greek lands. When Signor Rivoira writes³ that 'the Byzantine builders modified the external form of their domes, the form of which, under the potent influence of the Lombardic school, became polygonal,' he seems to us to be simply giving free play to his imagination. Granting that the baptistery of Galliano, than which⁴ 'there is no certainly dated example of a Lombard cupola earlier,' was erected in 1007; and even supposing that all churches of the type of that of the Virgin at Salonica were later than 1028 (which is out of the question), we do not for one moment believe that Lombardy could in a few years have exercised so potent an influence on the East, which after the Great Schism and the accession of the Macedonian house went its own way in matters of art.

Chapter V deals with those churches which can with some probability be held to date, partly or wholly, from the ninth or tenth centuries. Those that are important for domed construction are the baptisteries of Biella and Galliano. Those that in Signor Rivoira's opinion illustrate the development of vaulting best are San Babila at Milan, San Flaviano at Montefiascone, and the choir-ambulatory of Aversa Cathedral. In the latter two he claims that crossed vaulting with visible and independent ribs makes its appearance for the first time. About the ambulatory of Aversa we can say nothing, but the vaulting at Montefiascone can, we fear, not be dated from the inscription given us in photographic facsimile on p. 210 (fig. 300). It records a restoration and vaulting of the church after a double

¹ Rivoira, *op. cit.* p. 196.

² *Ibid.* p. 249.

³ *Ibid.* p. 155.

Ibid. p. 196.

collapse by one Sebitolandus, or possibly Landus, in the year 1302, not 1032 (read *trecentis*, not *tricenis*). The inscription is on this façade 'in the Pointed style.' Its contractions (so Mr. A. Souter informs the writer) suit the fourteenth century, but are not possible for 1032, such as *fc̄m* for 'factum,' *nōie* for *nomine*, *cs* for 'cuius,' *ūit* for 'uirt,' *cād* for 'card.' So that the date of San Flaviano remains doubtful and we cannot be sure that Mothes (p. 221) was wrong. Signor Rivoira's reconstruction of the history of San Ambrogio is very ingenious. It appears to be necessary to assume in connexion with his view that the nave belongs to the eleventh century (this has no documentary evidence); that the early atrium was pulled down (though he states otherwise), and that then the present atrium was 'engrafted' on to the narthex in the twelfth century. His views will no doubt be received with much favour. Why does he say he 'has' *discovered* the prototype of the Lombardic porch in the cathedral of Modena? No doubt the said portal is early and typical.

With the chapters on Burgundy, Normandy, and Germany it is impossible to deal without special qualifications, but we turn to the chapter on pre-Conquest Architecture in Britain with great pleasure. Professor Baldwin Brown has surveyed this field with a masterly and thorough treatment, but it is of course interesting to see a fresh view of the subject from a foreign authority. Professor Baldwin Brown's conclusion is that most of the peculiarities of his third period (roughly 950-1050) are derived from Germany, and that England was from the artistic point of view a province of Austrasia, with certain marked peculiarities of its own. Signor Rivoira does not in so many words endorse this view, but at least he admits that *lesenas* (in deference to him we will not call them 'Lisenen'), and triangular-headed arcading,¹

¹ St. Michael's (St. Albans) is stated (vol. ii. p. 160) to be the earliest dated instance of double-splayed windows in England. But the windows are single-splayed. Are we to understand that he supposes the walls to have been cut back in the shocking treatment this church has received, or has he misunderstood the sentence at the foot of p. 298 in Professor Baldwin Brown's book?

came to England from Germany, though he points out these features in Italy at a much earlier date. He seems to be a little inconsistent in this matter, for on p. 288 he allows Gernrode, as a pattern for England, to be of the date of 968, but on p. 297 he seems to put the north-west tower of Gernrode, on which the triangular-headed arcading occurs, about 1150. Very interesting is his comparison of St. Augustine's church of St. Pancras at Canterbury with the Palatine church of San Cesario, but he does not suppose that St. Augustine brought over Italian craftsmen. He places the church of St. Peter on the Wall after the synod of Whitby (664). He thinks that the western tower came to England from France in the tenth century, the first recorded example being Ramsey Abbey (974), and that the porch at Monkwearmouth was only enlarged into a tower after the Conquest. The latter view will surely not find favour. Signor Rivoira is extremely anxious to deny all Irish influence in Northumbrian carving, and perhaps he is right. To reject the western apse of the first cathedral of Canterbury as restored by Willis is unduly sceptical. There was certainly a west chapel, which did not run the whole breadth of the building, and he would not allow it to be square, for he is quite sure that there were no rectangular chancels before Dunstan's time. What, then, could there have been but a second apse? 'There is no absolute indication,' says Professor Baldwin Brown, 'that the church terminated towards the west in an apse, but the description makes this almost certain.' On p. 160 Signor Rivoira states that Lyminge (965) is the first dated instance of a rectangular chancel, but it must be noted that he adopts an improbably late date for Escomb. His suggestion that long and short work was introduced by French craftsmen from Poitou deserves consideration, but it only applies to the later period, and does not account for the same feature at Monkwearmouth and Escomb.

The author's treatment of Deerhurst is brief and not nearly so illuminating as Professor Baldwin Brown's. As to Bradford-on-Avon the two authorities agree, and so we must regretfully abandon the idea that the existing 'eccle-

siola' is the church of Aldhelm. It would be very natural that such a belief should grow up. We must seriously object to the dating of Escomb in the reign of Canute. Signor Rivoira's argument assumes what it ought to prove. To state first that Lyminge (965) is the earliest instance of a square chancel, and then argue that therefore Escomb is later, is a flagrant *petitio principii*. His only other argument is that the long and short work is rather a late than an early feature; after all, it only occurs markedly in the chancel arch. Escomb is largely built of Roman stones taken from the adjacent station of Binchester; this is enormously in favour of an early date. It is so solidly constructed that the Danes could hardly have burnt it to the ground. Signor Rivoira makes too much of fires: 'combusta est ecclesia' does not necessarily mean that the whole of the masonry of a stone building was destroyed. On Earl's Barton tower he says very felicitously that 'it may be called the swan's song of Anglo-Saxon architecture, in which some architect of the race combined in a sort of ill-ordered epitome all its leading characteristics, in order to form a kind of record for posterity.' As to Sompting, it is quite incredible that it belongs to the twelfth century: it might perhaps be dated about the Conquest, but not later. Signor Rivoira does not deem worthy of mention Professor Baldwin Brown's convincing suggestion that the tower of St. Benet, Cambridge, was originally also helmed, in which case Sompting does not stand absolutely alone. The chief difference, besides those already mentioned, between our author and English writers is that he places after the Conquest St. Michael's, Oxford, St. Benet's, Cambridge, and the whole group of Lincolnshire towers, while Professor Baldwin Brown dates the first two (approximately) in the reign of Canute and the other in the reign of the Confessor. He thinks, for instance, that keyhole windows are not necessarily a sign of pre-Conquest date. A keyhole window (now destroyed) was once to be seen in the church of Daphni, near Athens, which our author places, improbably late, in the eleventh century. It is difficult to prove him wrong about these towers, but he seems distinctly wrong about Glentworth, which presents

so many features reminding us of Germany, and German influence must have come to an end after the Conquest. One would have expected him at least to discuss Professor Baldwin Brown's suggestion *à propos* of Lorsch, that German 'Lisenen' were developed out of classic pilasters, but he does not even mention it.

The chapter on the Lombardo-Norman style in England is full of interest. We agree with Signor Rivoira in thinking that Norwich presents 'a whole of an imposing effect which is not equalled by any other church in the Lombardo-Norman style.' He produces a very striking parallel to the circular openings at Norwich in the tomb of Eurysaces, outside the walls of Rome. Is it possible that Herbert de Losinga saw this, or something similar, when he visited Rome in 1093? It is satisfactory to find that Signor Rivoira is in almost entire agreement with Mr. John Bilson in thinking that every part of Durham Cathedral was covered with ribbed vaulting between 1093 and 1133, that the choir with the vault, which preceded what we see to-day, was finished by 1104, and that first the northern transept, then the southern, was vaulted. So good an authority as Mr. Bond has doubted this and been rather inclined to ascribe the nave vaulting to Bishop Hugh Puiset, but Signor Rivoira's weight will probably turn the scale and bring about a general acceptance of this view, except, perhaps, in France. Whether William of St. Carilef got his ideas from San Flaviano at Montefiascone is more doubtful, as we can hardly feel sure that San Flaviano was in existence in its present form. The general impression left on us by Signor Rivoira's treatment of English architecture is that he has a thorough personal knowledge, great power of exposition, and great ingenuity in interpretation. But he is too dogmatic where the material is too slight to enable him to form an opinion. Thus he argues that the lions, from which spring the archivolts of the chancel arch in St. Benet's, Cambridge, denote foreign influence, whereas English carvers had previously only employed heads in a similar way. But he himself is the first to compare Etruscan use of heads with this. The fact is that our monuments are

so few that we can hardly say what we have lost, and excessive dogmatism is quite out of place. Nor is it in the least possible to say in what exact year square chancels or west towers were first introduced in England. What is really gratifying is that, with so small a number of existing works, we are really beginning to form clear ideas about the development of architecture on English soil. Nowhere is the wonderful outburst of productive skill more striking than in England of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. We are thankful to an acute foreign critic, who gives us the benefit of his wide knowledge to enable us to appreciate the more these precious monuments of the past.

We trust that this review, necessarily containing some criticism, will not appear captious or unappreciative. Signor Rivoira, from the standpoint of an Italian, seems to feel too much that *L'Orient c'est l'ennemi*. But really Greece helped Rome to fulfil her task in architecture as in other things. It is quite illuminating when Signor Rivoira shews us, from the evidence of old plans and drawings, and from such ruins as those of Hadrian's Villa, or the Tempio di Siepe, or the Sette Bassi, how much Roman architects actually put into practice, how the germs of later development are so often to be found in their work, and how they may well have inspired later architects. But we can feel all this and yet be quite sure that the spirit of Greece did not die when Memmius sacked Corinth, but lived on and was still able to permeate and saturate Christian art and architecture.

Art. VII.—THE SCOTTISH CONSECRATIONS IN LONDON IN 1610.

1. *History of the Church of Scotland*. By GEORGE COOK, D.D., (Edinburgh: Constable and Co. 1815.)
2. *Calderwood's History of the Kirk of Scotland*. (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society. 1842.)
3. *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*. By

- the Very Rev. JOHN LEE, D.D. (Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons. 1860.)
4. *History of the Kirk of Scotland.* By JOHN ROW. (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society. 1842.)
 5. *History of the Church of Scotland.* By the Right Rev. JOHN SPOTTISWOOD, Archbishop of St. Andrews. (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1851.)
 6. *History of the Episcopal Church.* By J. P. LAWSON. (Edinburgh: Gallie and Bailey. 1843.)
 7. *History of the Scottish Church.* By W. STEPHEN, D.D. (Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1896.)
 8. *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* By W. F. HOOK, D.D. (London: Bentley. 1872.)
 9. *Church History of Britain.* By THOMAS FULLER. (London: Tegg. 1868.)
 10. *Antiquities of the Christian Church.* By JOSEPH BINGHAM. Reprint from Original Edition. (London: Henry G. Bohn. 1843.)
 11. *Vita Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi, a Paulino ejus Notario.* 'Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta.' (London: David Nutt. 1869.)
 12. *Socrates and Sozomen: Church Histories.* 'Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.' (Oxford: Parker and Co. 1891.)
 13. *History of the Christian Church.* By J. G. Robertson. (London: John Murray. 1876.)
 14. *The Ministry of the Christian Church.* By CHARLES GORE, D.D., [now Bishop of Birmingham]. (London: Rivingtons. 1889.)
- And other Works.

[In order to carry out the advice of the Lambeth Conference that every effort should be made to further the cause of Reunion, especially with the Presbyterian Churches, by conference and study, it is proposed in a series of articles to discuss the problem of Presbyterianism and Reunion from various points of view.¹ The articles will in each case be

¹ Reference may be made to the articles on 'Presbyterianism and Reunion' (C.Q.R. January 1909); 'The Problem of Reunion in

signed, and the writers alone will be responsible for the views put forward.—ED. *C.Q.R.*]

ON October 21, in the year 1610, John Spottiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow, Gavin Hamilton, Bishop of Galloway, and Andrew Lamb, Bishop of Brechin, were consecrated in the chapel of London House. In the various accounts of the consecrations there is a surprising amount of disagreement as to the consecrators, when we consider that history claims to be an exact science. Some historians state that they were the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath; while others describe the rite as having been administered by four bishops. The latter is the correct version, and the discrepancy among the historians is easily explained. The original arrangement was that the three bishops already named should perform the consecrations, but the Bishop of Bath was ultimately unable to take part, and the Bishops of Rochester and Worcester were then added to the other two.

The remarkable circumstance in this consecration of bishops is, that though they were consecrated according to the prescribed Form of the Church of England, the bishops so consecrated were not to be bishops of the Church of England, or to be in any way subject to that Church; and neither of the English archbishops took part in the rite. Those who were thus consecrated were to be bishops of the neighbouring Church of Scotland. Indeed, they already enjoyed in their own country the title and jurisdiction of bishops, but they had not received consecration to their office by the ancient and apostolic method of the laying-on of hands. One sufficient reason for this omission at the time was that there was no one in Scotland qualified, by his own possession of valid consecration according to the primitive model to give that gift to anyone else. This reason may be allowed to pass, without going into the circumstance that many of the Scottish reformers opposed

Scotland,' by the Rev. J. Cooper, D.D. (*C.Q.R.* April 1909); 'The Reunion Problem: a Scottish Episcopal View,' by the Very Rev. T. I. Ball, LL.D. (*C.Q.R.* July 1909); and 'Another Scottish Episcopal View,' by the Rev. T. Hannan (*C.Q.R.* January 1910).

episcopacy on the ground that it was unscriptural, unprimitive, and unnecessary.

The Scottish Church was reformed after some delay, and in face of opposition in quarters similar to those from which the English Reformation had received help. This influenced the character and tendencies of the Scottish Reformation, which became more drastic as opposition was continued. When matters settled, the name and office of Bishop were revived; and it was natural that, when opportunity occurred, the name and office should be supported by the primitive authority of consecration. That which has happened once may happen again, and so it is of importance to trace the events which led up to the interesting event of which the tercentenary has just passed, as well as to consider the circumstances and results of the event.

Even before Luther was heard of on the Continent, people in Scotland had been summoned before the Archbishop of Glasgow for doctrines very similar to those which he preached. The pressure of the Reformation movement was felt in 1536, when King James V summoned a National Council, the professed object of which was the improvement of the morals of the clergy. In 1552 a second provincial council authorized the publication of a catechism in the mother tongue, containing an exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. This catechism bore the name of Archbishop Hamilton on the title-page, and was published at his expense. It was sold at the price of twopence Scots, which led to its being contemptuously called the 'twopenny faith.' This contempt may be better realized when it is stated that 'one pound Scots' was only one shilling and eightpence English. Immediately afterwards a third provincial council was held at Linlithgow; but the tendency of this council was reactionary, the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent being received as binding on the Church of Scotland. The death of Edward VI of England in 1553 reversed the Reformation in that country; and it had a powerful effect in Scotland, where George Wishart had been martyred in 1545, and where John Rough and John Knox had already

been associated with the lords who had adopted the doctrines of the Reformation.

Another step in the progress of the Reformation in Scotland is marked by the failure of various petitions which were presented to the Queen-mother, Mary of Guise, who was Regent for her daughter, Mary Queen of Scots. On the failure of these petitions, several of the leading nobles banded themselves together for their mutual protection in the propagation of the reformed doctrines. This took place in the year 1557, and those who thus banded themselves together came to be known as the 'Lords of the Congregation.' Their tendencies may be gathered from the fact, that on December 3 of that year these lords concluded, after deliberation, 'That in all parishes the curates should be caused to read the prayers and lessons of the Old and New Testament on Sundays and other festival days, according to the form set forth in the Book of Common Prayers.' This book was either the first or the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, but it was without doubt the English book, which indicates that the movement in Scotland was at this time proceeding on lines parallel with those of the English Reformation. The principal 'Lords of the Congregation' were the Earls of Argyll, Glencairn, and Morton, Archibald, Lord of Lorn, Sir James Sandilands of Calder, John Erskine of Dun, and William Maitland of Lethington, younger. The year 1560 is noted for the first General Assembly of the reformed religion. This General Assembly comprised a very small number of representatives, and lacked continuity with previous church order in the fact that some of its ministers had received no form of ordination whatever. It is difficult to say whether this was due to rapid deviation from the methods of the English Reformation, or to the difficulty of obtaining recruits from the old ministry—perhaps a combination of these reasons would approach the truth. At all events, it is a notable fact that many laymen advanced to the position of 'placed ministers' without any form of ordination—like Paul Methven, a baker, who became a leading light, was minister of Jedburgh in 1560 (although he does not appear to have been a

member of the General Assembly of that year), and was afterwards deposed and put to repentance for adultery.¹

The lack of ordination of any kind was not considered by that Assembly as a matter of importance. In the First Book of Discipline, which was drawn up by its order, the imposition of hands was distinctly given up, and the following statement made: 'For albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremonie we judge not necessarie.' This meeting of General Assembly had been preceded by a Parliament in July, by the orders of which a Confession of Faith had been drawn up, discussed, and passed, on July 17. Four bishops were present, St. Andrews, Dunblane, Dunkeld, and Gallo-way, of whom only the last belonged to the reforming party; there were also several reformed abbots and priors; but no objection was made by anyone to this Confession of Faith.

The Second Book of Discipline, which was adopted in 1581, restored imposition of hands, making it necessary that all office-bearers should receive imposition of hands from the elders. John Knox was the leading spirit, of course, in all these proceedings, and he had already organized the new system by the appointment of superintendents, ministers, and elders. Yet it appears that in some places, at least, practice was better than the precept; for, in an 'Epistle to the Faithful' written by Erskine of Dun, the Superintendent of Angus, in 1572, the mode of admitting ministers is said to be 'public, by imposition of hands by the pastors, with admonitions, fasting, and prayers passing before.' This epistle was very probably a result of the proceedings of the General Assembly of January 12, 1572, at Leith. That Assembly appointed six of its members to confer with six members of the Regent Mar's Council, and the result of their deliberations appeared in seven Articles, which were adopted, after discussion, by the Assembly held at Perth the following August. By the Articles, the archbishoprics and bishoprics at the time void were to be

¹ Sage, *Presbytery Examined*, p. 100; Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 210; Row, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, p. 25.

given to the most qualified of the ministry, elections to sees were to be duly made by cathedral chapters on the recommendation of the King and the Regent, and ministers were to be ordained by the bishops, or, where there was no bishop placed, by the superintendent of the bounds. Thus was established the titular episcopacy, John Douglas being made Archbishop of St. Andrews, James Boyd Archbishop of Glasgow, James Paton Bishop of Dunkeld, and Andrew Grahame Bishop of Dunblane.

These, and others who were subsequently appointed, were the famous 'tulchan' bishops. John Knox had had a stroke of apoplexy in 1570, but he survived until November 1572, and was capable of a great pulpit effort on the receipt of the news of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day in that year. It cannot be supposed that he would have passed over the restoration of bishops if he had objected to the order as a matter of essential principle; and it seems quite clear that this restoration of bishops was quite in sequence with his own establishment of superintendents. It falls to be remarked that the bishops who adhered to the Roman obedience do not appear to have taken any measures to keep up the succession, and the bishops who cast in their lot with the Reformation appear to have accepted the position of minister or of superintendent without any special reference to their previously recognized office in the Church. Side by side there existed bishops with no recognition in the reformed organization, bishops who were appointed ministers or superintendents, and laymen who received the same offices. The confusion illustrates the danger of pulling down an old institution completely in order to reconstruct it on better principles.

An important document is the 'Petition of the Nine Articles,' presented to the Regent Morton by the Assembly which met at Leith in August 1574. This petition had reference to the revenues of the Church, which were being sadly misused and diverted from their proper purposes. The petition is specially notable for its request 'that his grace would provide qualified persons for bishoprics.'¹

¹ Sage, *Presbytery Examined*, p. 252.

In this year Andrew Melville returned to Scotland from his sojourn at Geneva under the influence of Theodore Beza, and it is from his return that the movement against prelacy as such, apart from abuses, takes its definite date. Year after year the opposition of Melville to episcopacy was actively shewn in the Assemblies, until at last an 'Act of Assembly' abolished the office of bishop in 1578. In 1580 a Confession of Faith was put forth, and in 1581 Presbyteries were organized by the order of the General Assembly. The Confession was also known as the Covenant. These presbyteries were not agreed to by the King until 1586,¹ nor ratified by Parliament until 1596, nor do the deliverances of Assemblies against bishops appear to have carried with them any statutory force. Bishops continued their ministrations, and in 1600 we read of three members of the Commission of the General Assembly being appointed by the King to the sees of Ross, Caithness, and Aberdeen, the new bishops being David Lindsay, minister of Leith, George Gladstones, minister of St. Andrews, and Peter Blackburn, minister of Aberdeen. In fact, the period from the advent of Andrew Melville is marked by steady attempts on the part of the ministers and General Assembly to encroach on what had hitherto been regarded as the prerogatives of King and Parliament, as in the case where the General Assembly prescribed² that all masters of ships should give up, immediately on their arrival in Scotland, the names of all strangers who were passengers in their ships. This Assembly further recommended that those who disobeyed this ordinance should be punished. The King was gradually placed in that position of ignominy which is known to history, when his ministers of religion used most disrespectful language to him, and preached at him as if he were the vilest in the land. His succession to the English crown gave him a happy escape. Andrew Melville on one occasion seized the king's sleeve and called him 'God's sillie vassal,'³ which probably only meant 'God's weak vassal,' as the word 'silly' is often used in Scotland in that sense. On

¹ Sage, *op. cit.* p. 290.

² Row, *op. cit.* p. 90.

³ Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. v. p. 440.

another occasion, when questioned at Whitehall about some scurrilous verses which he had written about the King's Chapel, he seized the lawn sleeves of Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, shook them, and called them 'Romish rags' and 'a part of the Beast's marke.'¹

As the time of the King's succession to the throne of England approached, the influence of the Melville faction seems to have diminished, and the titular episcopacy came to be generally accepted by consent. Once settled in England, James was freed from the coercion which he had experienced in Scotland, and the pacification of the Scottish Church proceeded so far that an Assembly held at Glasgow in June 1610 gave a complete recognition to episcopal government,² and the three prelates mentioned at the beginning of this article went to London to report matters to the King. James then issued a special commission to the Bishop of London for their consecration, which took place as stated in the chapel of London House.

A full and evidently candid account of the incidents which led up to the consecrations is given by Spottiswood, the episcopalian historian, who was one of those consecrated. The King had called three of the titular bishops to London, where they arrived in the middle of September.³ At the first audience James intimated to them what he had in mind about their consecration, and Spottiswood answered in the name of himself and the others 'that they were willing to obey his majesty's desire, and only feared that the Church of Scotland, because of old usurpations, might take this for a sort of subjection to the Church of England.' The reference in these words is to the claim of primacy made in ancient days by the see of York over the bishops of Scotland. This claim had always been resisted by Scotland, and even when Roger, Archbishop of York, had received from Pope Anastasius IV a bull making him Metropolitan of Scotland, the prelates of Scotland repudiated his authority, consecrated the Bishop of St. Andrews without reference

¹ Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. vi. p. 597.

² Row, *op. cit.* p. 273.

³ Spottiswood, *History of the Church of Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 208.

to him, and then appealed to the Pope against his claim. Pope Alexander III issued a bull which asserted the independence of the Scottish Church of all sees except his own. This was in the middle of the twelfth century. The King intimated that he had thought of this objection, and had arranged that neither of the English primates should take part in the consecration. The Scottish bishops then agreed, thanking the King for his care for their church, and the date and place were fixed.

The Presbyterian historians, Calderwood and Row, have misrepresented this consecration. The fact that they were contemporary with Spottiswood makes their misrepresentation inexcusable, as it was within their power to ascertain the exact truth regarding the various circumstances if they did not know it; while the fact of their being contemporary with the events has naturally led to their statements being received with much confidence. Row¹ states that the bishops were consecrated with anointing of oil and other ceremonies, 'just according to the English fashion and pontificall of the Papists.' The foundation for this statement is an entry in Andrew Melville's diary; but Sir James Balfour, Lord Lyon King at Arms to Charles I and Charles II, wrote regarding it: 'This consecration was performed, *mutatis mutandis*, according to the Church of England.' The three thus consecrated returned immediately to Scotland, and proceeded to consecrate the other titular bishops, and those who were afterwards appointed, 'first quietlie,' according to Row, 'as being ashamed of the foolish guyses in it, but afterwards more and more solemnlie as their estate grew, and as they were favoured by their prince.'

Those who were thus consecrated in Scotland were George Gladstones, Archbishop of St. Andrews; David Lindsay, Bishop of Ross; Alexander Douglas, Bishop of Moray; Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles; George Grahame, Bishop of Dunblane; Peter Blackburn, Bishop of Aberdeen; Alexander Lindsay, Bishop of Dunkeld; Alexander Forbes, Bishop of Caithness; and Neil Campbell,

¹ *History*, p. 283.

Bishop of Argyll.¹ The consecrations made the Presbyterian party more than ever bitter against them. The terrible conditions of controversy in those days are illustrated by verses which were written both in Latin and in English, and disseminated in Edinburgh and throughout the country in 1609. Calderwood and Row have preserved the verses² without a word of condemnation. The English of the lines is as follows :

St. Androes loves a cup of wine,
 Wine Glasgow with an whoore ;
 Rosse companie, play Galloway,
 Brechin not to be poore.
 Orkney the Court, Moray the pott,
 The Ysles loves to deceive ;
 Dunblane to trifle, and Aberdene
 A glorious name to have.
 By chance Dunkel has lighted so
 That Jacob he would bee ;
 But, O, good Catnes, when comes thow
 Thy flock to teach or see ?
 For life and doctrine they may al
 Resigne it to Argill ;
 So faith has left the Lowland clean,
 Gone to the hills awhile.'

According to these lines, the King's choice of bishops was in every case except that of Argyll the choice of a man absolutely unfitted to be placed in any spiritual post. It may be imagined to what an extent an ignorant multitude could be excited against the rulers in Church and State by the dissemination of writings which had not the palliation of being produced by ignorant men, but were the creations of men well versed in Latin.

A very slight examination of the records of the lives of these bishops is sufficient to shew how libellous were the statements made against them. Spottiswood's career is well known. He was the son of John Spottiswood, who had

¹ Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. vii. p. 3 ; Row, *op. cit.* p. 293.

² Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. vii. p. 2 ; Row, *op. cit.* p. 293.

been Superintendent of Lothian, Merse, and Teviotdale, under the system established by John Knox. The elder Spottiswood had been also minister of Calder, and in this position his son John succeeded him. He gained the favour of the Duke of Lennox, whom he accompanied to France as chaplain in the embassy of 1601. When the King succeeded to the throne of England, Spottiswood accompanied him to his new home, whence he returned to Scotland as titular Archbishop of Glasgow. Until his death in 1639 at Newcastle, the year after the overthrow of episcopacy in Scotland, his life was in accordance with his position as the highest ecclesiastic in the land. Gavin Hamilton as a minister was for years a member of the Commission of the General Assembly, apparently enjoying the confidence of his brethren. Andrew Lamb was a member of the first General Assembly, in 1560, being a representative of Leith, and in much later days he is found as a Commissioner of the General Assembly. Possibly he was not a man of great oratorical power. A modern historian¹ says that an English statesman who had heard Lamb preach on a public occasion before he became Bishop of Brechin, said that instead of a Lamb he found a sheep in the pulpit. But he had seen the Reformation through from the beginning, and cannot have been an unworthy man, since he had served in the ministry fifty years before his consecration.

The statements against George Gladstones are specially revolting. In 1587, being minister of Angus, he was worthy of the protection of the General Assembly, which complained to the King that William Douglas, son of the Laird of Glenbervie, had beset him and another minister, Mr. Andrew Mylne, with armed men.² Eight years later he was appointed by the General Assembly one of a number of Commissioners to advise with the King as to the 'godlie brethrein of the ministrie' who should be about the King. Apparently in this association he commended himself to James, for he was placed as minister at St. Andrews in 1597, instead of another who was removed, and this without the

¹ W. Stephen, *History*, vol. ii. p. 206.

² Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. iv. p. 660.

consent of the Presbytery.¹ Row says that 'he lived a filthie bellie-god ; he died of a filthie and loathsome disease,'² which he describes by a Greek term meaning 'worm-eaten.'³ This historian preserves verses which he described as an 'epitaph,' and also the Archbishop's alleged prayer after supper, which are unfit for reproduction in the present day, and he concludes with the words, 'Let that perjured apostat's filthie memorie stink, rot, perish.' But Spottiswood gives a totally different description of the Archbishop:

'A man of good learning, ready utterance, and great invention, but of an easy nature, and induced by those he trusted to do many things hurtful to the see, especially in leasing the tithes of his benefice for many ages to come, and for a small duty ; esteeming (which is the error of many churchmen) that by this means he should purchase the love and friendship of men, whereas there is no sure friendship but that which is joined with respect ; and to the preserving of this, nothing conduceth more than a wise and prudent administration of the church-rents wherewith they are intrusted. He left behind him in writing a declaration of his judgment touching matters then controverted in the Church, professing that he had accepted the episcopal function upon good warrant, and that his conscience did never accuse him for anything done that way. This he did to obviate the rumours which he foresaw would be dispersed after his death, either of his recantation or of some trouble of spirit that he was cast into (for these are the usual practices of the puritan sect) whereas he ended his days most piously, and to the great comfort of all the beholders.'⁴

David Lindsay was contemporary with Andrew Lamb. He was one of the first ministers of the 'planting of superintendents and ministers' in 1560, and was planted in Leith at the same time that John Knox was made minister of Edinburgh, and Paul Methven, that weak saint, was made minister of Jedburgh. He visited Knox on his death-bed, as a trusted and respected friend, and he had tasted persecution by being interned in prison at Blackness in 1584,

¹ Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. v. pp. 369, 650.

² Row, *op. cit.* p. 303.

³ Acts xii. 23.

⁴ Spottiswood, *History*, vol. iii. p. 227

where he had a wonderful dream. He was a member of the first General Assembly, and was chosen Moderator of that which met in Edinburgh in February 1569. Though a Court Chaplain, he offended the King by maintaining that 'the kirk might excommunicat the king.' That he was made a bishop after forty years of such service in the ministry ought to be a testimony to the honesty of the king who nominated him, and to the worthiness of the man himself.

James Law was minister of Kirkliston, near Edinburgh.¹ He was appointed by the General Assembly of July 1601 to be one of the ministers to his Majesty's household; in 1605 he was appointed titular Bishop of Orkney; while in 1608 he was elected Moderator of the General Assembly which met at Linlithgow in July. Andrew Knox was deserving of confidence in 1582, being minister of Paisley, and a witness against some who had used violence to the Moderator of the Glasgow Presbytery. Ten years afterwards he was still zealous in the cause of the reformed religion, and took it upon himself, with the help of a number of 'schollers of Glasgow, gentlemen's sonnes, and other friends,' to apprehend Mr. George Ker, brother of Lord Newbattle, as he lay in Fairlie roads ready to depart for the Continent, on a charge of being a papist. It appears that only after appointment as bishop in 1605 did he become an unworthy minister. Peter Blackburn had served under Andrew Melville at Glasgow University in 1575, he was minister of Aberdeen, was chosen Moderator of the General Assembly which met at Dundee in March 1598, and was not long afterwards made Bishop of Aberdeen. Calderwood states² that he was chosen Moderator 'by the king's authoritie, and pluralitie of votes, speciallie of northland ministers and barons'—which seems to indicate that he was held in high esteem by those who knew him best.

The position and character of the others who were made bishops appear to have been of very much the same level. Among the charges made against the bishops is that of coveting the wealth attaching to the office; while

¹ Row, *op. cit.* p. 559.

² *History*, vol. v. p. 682

it is also charged against the same individuals that they died in debt. It was only with great difficulty that King James was able in some cases to redeem a small portion of the alienated property of sees, to re-endow the bishoprics. It can hardly be doubted that the appointments were made on principles as honest and public-spirited as those which dictated the appointments to sees in England. That King James was actuated by honest motives, and without prejudice against individuals, receives presumptive support in his appointment of Bancroft from the see of London to that of Canterbury in 1604. Dr. Bancroft had written a book in which he had opposed the right of James to succeed Elizabeth. Yet, in the very year following his accession to the English throne, James had promoted Bancroft to the Primacy. Evidently Andrew Melville could not understand such moderation, and he gave the Archbishop a bad quarter of an hour when he was called before the King's Council in London. Bancroft presided in the King's absence, which Row seems to regard as having been intended by the King to allow Melville 'a fair opportunitie to light leil upon Bishop Bancroft'—which he did. When the Archbishop told Melville that he was accused of treason, Melville protested that he was no traitor, but that there was a certain Dr. Bancroft who was a traitor, having written a book against the King's right to the throne of England. The Archbishop did not know what to say—we can well believe it.¹

Calderwood writes spitefully of the death of Bancroft, that he 'endit his life miserablie,' and further, that 'he cryed to his servants to kill him.'² The same historian says that he left his servants discontented by his will, and that one of them wrote an epitaph :

'Here lyeth *dic ecclesiae*, suspected a Papist,
Who lived a Matchiavel and died ane Atheist.'

How far this estimate is from the truth may be judged

¹ Row, *op. cit.* p. 286.

² Calderwood, *op. cit.* vol. vii. p. 151.

from the single fact that Archbishop Whitgift, in recommending him for the see of London, stated that his conversation had been without blame in the world; that he had taken all the degrees in school as other men had done; that he was not of the presbyterial faction; that since he had professed divinity he had ever opposed himself against all sects and innovations; that though he had been careful and earnest to suppress some sort of sectaries, yet had he therein shewed no tyrannous disposition, but with mildness and kind dealing had reclaimed many; that he had been a preacher against popery above twenty-four years.¹ His absolutely moderate and conciliatory disposition in ecclesiastical affairs is shewn in connexion with the Scottish consecrations. In Spottiswood's account of the arrangement made by the King, it is said:

'A question in the meantime was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained that thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches. This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day and in the place appointed the three Scottish bishops were consecrated.'²

That the appointments of the Scottish bishops were made under a sense of responsibility, and that the men chosen were not the inferior and ungodly men whom Row and Calderwood have represented them to be, must be assumed by comparing and considering the English appointments made by the King. Besides the Primate, who only acted as adviser, the English bishops who performed the consecration, and the Bishop of Bath, who was to have taken part, had all been appointed by King James. Abbot, Bishop of London, was a man of great ability. The son of Maurice Abbot, a clothworker of Guildford in Surrey,

¹ Strype's *Whitgift*.

² *History*, vol. iii. p. 209.

he was born on October 29, 1562. He was educated at the free Grammar School of his native town, and was entered a member of Balliol College, Oxford, in 1578. He was elected a probationer fellow of his college in 1583, received Holy Orders soon after, and became a frequent preacher, acquiring great popularity in the University. The sympathy of his views with those of the Scottish reformation may be perceived from the circumstance that when Laud, being proctor and reader of a theological lecture at Oxford at the same time that Abbot was Vice-Chancellor for the second time, maintained the continuity of the Apostolic Church through the Roman and Eastern branches, Abbot maintained the contrary opinion, contending that the Roman Church formed no part of the mystical body of Christ. Abbot's resentment followed Laud throughout his career. The extreme honesty of Abbot's opinions and actions is seen in the circumstance that he lost the favour of the King temporarily through opposing the divorce of Lady Essex, and that at a later period, when he was Archbishop of Canterbury, he spoke frankly and strongly to James against the proposed Spanish match.¹ The honesty and fairness of both the King and his Archbishop are shewn in these events, and also when between these two occasions Abbot had had the misfortune to kill a keeper, while shooting at a deer with a crossbow in Lord Zouch's park in Hampshire. This misfortune, which threw him into the deepest melancholy, entailed upon him by common law the forfeiture of all his property to the King, and by canon law his suspension from all ecclesiastical functions; but the King declared that 'an angel might have miscarried in this sort,' and an act of pardon and dispensation passed the Great Seal, releasing the Archbishop from all the pains and penalties.

Lancelot Andrewes was a man of a different type from Abbot, but distinguished by ability and piety of a very high order. He was born at Barking in 1555, became Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and was Dean of Westminster when James ascended the English throne. He took part in the Hampton Court Conference, and was

¹ Row, *op. cit.* p. 333.

in turn Bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester. He was one of the translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible.

Had Dr. James Montague taken part in the consecration, he would have made a third who had had frequent opportunities of meeting Scottish ministers of different views, including the redoubtable Andrew Melville.

The consecrations of 1610 are interesting as an historical event, exhibiting the power which the Church of England might be, and may yet be, in the Reformed Churches, in the restoration of complete Apostolical Order to those churches, without any encroachment upon their national independence. It is remarkable that the first reformers practically all valued government by bishops. The assertion that episcopacy is unscriptural is a later phase, but this phase has practically passed even in churches which have not bishops, so that they are very largely prepared to consider the question of episcopal government on its own merits. But there is no relic of these consecrations in the present succession of bishops anywhere. Episcopacy in Scotland fell in 1638, and, although it was restored in 1661, there was only one bishop of that succession surviving. He took no part in the consecrations of the new period, and he did not long survive. There is a very important difference in the consecrations of the two periods, which is quite certain to be discussed when any definite proposals for reunion on the basis of the conveyance of the episcopal succession to a non-episcopal church may arise. This difference is that in 1610 the bishops were consecrated *per saltum*, that is to say, they were consecrated to the office of bishops without previously having been ordained deacons and priests.

It is a very remarkable comment on the means adopted by the Scottish reformers to establish a reformed ministry that so many who were laymen were placed in the ministry; so that two of the bishops, David Lindsay and Andrew Lamb, whose ministry had dated from the first year of the establishment of the Scottish Reformation, were not able to connect themselves with the pre-Reformation Church by the possession of Priests' Orders. The suggestion of

Bishop Andrewes that the titular bishops must first be ordained presbyters, and the Archbishop's view that this was unnecessary, have been already mentioned. It is sometimes stated, on the authority of Heylin, that Bancroft also used the argument that the higher Order included the lower, and that there had been instances of bishops being consecrated *per saltum*. Lee, a Presbyterian historian, accepts this statement¹; but Cook, an earlier Presbyterian historian whose statements are usually moderate and fair, denounces the assertion.² The former argument is quite in keeping with Abbot's views as to the Roman Church having ceased to be part of the visible body of Christ; but the latter view, that the higher Order includes the lower, seems the only view which is capable of being supported, by either logic or history, in such a way as to approach certainty.

It is interesting and important to consider the historical grounds on which this latter view is founded, especially as the statement is frequently made as if it admitted of no doubt. The explanation of the confidence with which the view is put forward is to be found in the fact that proposition and proof are supposed to be included in the one statement. The proposition is that the higher Order includes the lower, and the proof is that there had been instances of bishops being consecrated *per saltum*. The proposition seems logical and reasonable, and might be held true as a matter of theory, though there were no concrete examples to shew that the early Church had held and acted upon the view. But the supposed proof which is linked to the proposition asserts that there are such concrete examples; and, though many writers have handed on the statement as if already proved, it is worth while to make some inquiry into the nature of the proof.

Bishop Russell, who edited the *History* written by Spottiswood, took the matter up, and wrote, in his 'Life' of the Archbishop prefixed to the *History*:

'The argument of the English primate has not been approved

¹ *Lectures*, vol. ii. p. 187.

² *History*, vol. ii. p. 245.

in later times in any country where the true principles of the Church have been received, though instances may be found at an earlier period in which the episcopate was obtained in a manner not less uncanonical. The loose notions derived from Wittenburg and Zurich had not ceased to exert their influence in some portions of the Anglican communion; and the opinions of Zuinglius and Calvin were in certain quarters more powerful than the Apostolical Canons which at least indicate the practice of the Church at a very early period of her history.' ¹

Bingham establishes the rule that a bishop should not come to his office *per saltum*,² but should first pass through some, if not all, of the inferior orders of the ministry. But he gives a list ³ of deacons who were elevated directly to the episcopal throne, and then he notes instances of laymen being similarly raised: 'There want not also several instances of persons, who were ordained bishops immediately of laymen, when God by His particular providence seemed to point them out as the fittest men.' He lays special stress on the case of St. Ambrose of Milan, but mentions also Cyprian of Carthage, Nectarius of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Caesarea.

The case of St. Ambrose is so often mentioned that it is worthy of being examined carefully. It also happens that there are considerable materials on which to found an opinion. Ambrose was a Christian in belief and practice, but unbaptized, when the Emperor Valentinian sent him to be governor of Milan, the words of Probus the Prefect to him being: 'Vade, age non ut judex, sed ut episcopus,' which were afterwards regarded as inspired prophetic words. The *Vita Sancti Ambrosii*, by Paulinus, his notary or clerk, describes how Valentinian received the report of the election of Ambrose to be bishop: 'Qui summo gaudio accepit, quod judex a se directus ad sacerdotium peteretur,'⁴ 'who received with the greatest joy that a judge appointed by himself should be sought for the priesthood.' The word *sacerdotium* may simply be used in a general sense as

¹ *History*, vol. ii. p. xxxix.

² *Ibid.* § 7.

³ *Antiquities*, bk. ii. cap. 10, § 4.

⁴ Cap. 8.

implying that 'sacerdotium' is included in the episcopal office—as we should use the term 'sacred office.' Or it may possibly indicate the existence at that date of the views apparently held by Jerome, and adopted in the present day by Dr. Gore, if we have read his works aright,¹ that the episcopate is a kind of specialization of function derived out of the priesthood, or that the priesthood is a limited delegation of episcopal functions and power. In this case, the phrase may be used to support the idea that Ambrose received the episcopal gift in a single ordination.

But the chapter which follows this proceeds: 'Postulavit non se nisi a catholico episcopo baptizari: sollicite enim cavebat perfidiam Arianorum. Baptizatus itaque fertur omnia ecclesiastica officia implesse atque octava die episcopus ordinatus est summa cum gratia et laetitia cunctorum' — 'He stipulated that he should not be baptized except by a catholic bishop: for he anxiously guarded against the perfidy of the Arians. And so, being baptized, he is related to have filled all the ecclesiastical offices, and on the eighth day he was ordained bishop, with the utmost favour and joy of all.'² This seems a very plain narrative—if the phrase *omnia ecclesiastica officia* were expanded to shew us what the words comprehend. What were *omnia ecclesiastica officia*? The question seems to be answered by a passage quoted by Bingham³ from an epistle of Cyprian, in which reference is made to the elevation of Cornelius to the see of Rome: 'Non iste ad episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum saepe promeritus, ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit.' If the phrase *per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus* of Cyprian be compared with *omnia ecclesiastica officia implesse* of Paulinus, and the context in each case considered, there can be little doubt that the elevation of St. Ambrose was *per saltum* only with reference to election, and not with regard to consecration. When it is considered that only twenty-seven

¹ See the Bishop of Birmingham's work, *The Church and the Ministry*.

² Cap. 9.

³ *Antiquities*, bk. ii. cap. 10, § 4 (note).

years before the elevation of St. Ambrose, the Western bishops at the Council of Sardica enacted the following canon,¹ 'If a rich man, or one educated in a school, or a pleader in the Forum, be thought worthy to be made a Bishop, let him not be ordained until he have performed the ministry of a Reader, Sub-deacon, Deacon, and Presbyter, and he shall continue some time in each Order; for no one ought easily and suddenly to be ordained Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon,' the evidence is strongly contrary to the view that Ambrose was consecrated bishop without being ordained to any lower Order, even when it is clear that his election was contrary to the intention of the Canon.

If we consult the *Breviarium Romanum*, the Office for St. Ambrose on December 7 gives a similar answer. In the account of the bishop's life it says: 'Itaque cum ad populi desiderium imperatoris voluntas accederet, Ambrosius baptizatus (erat enim catechumenus) sacrisque initiatus, ac servatis omnibus ex instituto Ecclesiae ordinum gradibus, octavo die qui fuit septimo Idus Decembris episcopale onus suscepit'—'Therefore, when the will of the Emperor was added to the desire of the people, Ambrose, being baptized (for he was a catechumen), and initiated in sacred things, and all the degrees of Orders being observed according to the rule of the Church, on the eighth day, which was the 7th of December, assumed the episcopal burden.' Of course, it does not follow that the Breviary is reliable history because it is the *Breviarium Romanum*; but as a commentary on the 'Life' by Paulinus, it is worthy of respect, and the words *servatis omnibus ex instituto Ecclesiae ordinum gradibus* are an expansion of the words *omnia ecclesiastica officia*, which supports the argument based on the quotation from the Epistle of Cyprian.

The Greek Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen are alleged to bear out the theory that Ambrose was consecrated *per saltum*. Socrates knew little of the West, and wrote after A.D. 439, while Sozomen knew as little of the West, wrote his *History* about A.D. 443, and followed Socrates for events. The elevation of Ambrose was about

¹ Canon 10.

the year 374. The story of St. Ambrose is thus told by Socrates :

‘ And having baptized him, for he was a catechumen, they were about to invest him with the episcopal office. But although Ambrose willingly received baptism, he with great earnestness refused to be ordained ; upon which the bishops referred the matter to the Emperor Valentinian. This prince regarding the universal consent of the people as the work of God, sent word to the bishops to do the will of God by ordaining him, declaring that his choice was by the voice of God rather than by the votes of men.’¹

There is absolutely nothing in this account to indicate either that Ambrose was, or was not, consecrated *per saltum*.

The case of Cyprian seems to be open to the same doubt,² and when other cases come to be examined, it is found that there is a danger of confounding election with ordination. Bingham gives a warning on this point,³ noting that *cheirotomia* does not always denote ordination, but sometimes only designation or election, as in a phrase used by Ignatius to signify the appointment of a messenger to go on an errand for the Church.⁴

The elevation of Nectarius resembles that of Ambrose very considerably, and the date is only a few years later. When Gregory Nazianzen retired from the see of Constantinople in the year 381, Nectarius succeeded him, and the manner of his elevation is recorded by Socrates, in a passage which may be translated very literally thus :

‘ There was a certain man, Nectarius his name, of senatorial descent, of agreeable manner, admired by everyone, although holding the office of praetor. Who, being laid hold of by the

¹ “ Καὶ βαπτίσαντες, κατηχούμενος γὰρ ἦν, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἱερωσύνην προχειρίζεσθαι ἔμελλον. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἀμβρόσιος τὸ μὲν βάπτισμα ἡδέως ἐδέξατο, πολλὺς δὲ ἦν τὴν ἱερωσύνην παραιτούμενος, γνωρίζουσι τῷ βασιλεῖ Οὐαλεντινιανῷ τὰ γενόμενα. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς θαυμάσας τὴν τοῦ λαοῦ ὁμόνοιαν, θεοῦ τε ἔργον εἶναι γνοὺς τὸ γενόμενον ἐδήλου τοῖς ἐπισκόποις, ὑπουργεῖν τῷ θεῷ κελεύοντι χειροτονεῖν· θεοῦ γὰρ μᾶλλον, ἢ ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τὴν ψῆφον τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ.”—*H.E.* lib. iv. cap. 30.

² Robertson, *History*, vol. i. p. 163.

³ *Antiquities*, IV. vi. 11.

⁴ χειροτονῆσαι θεοπροσβυτήν.

people, was thrust forward into the episcopate, of those then present one hundred and fifty ordaining him bishop.' ¹

This extraordinary number is explained by the fact that the Council of Constantinople was sitting. But there is nothing in this account to indicate that he was not ordained deacon and priest before being advanced to the episcopate, even though he wore the white dress of the neophyte under the episcopal robes.² If he were consecrated *per saltum*, the association of so many bishops with the consecration might be taken as settling the principle for all time. But there is nothing in the account to indicate a departure from the normal so far as the consecration is concerned; and the number of bishops involved makes it practically certain that there was no departure from the normal course—especially when we remember how easily bishops in those days differed seriously from each other.

The consecrating bishops who in 1610 did not insist on the Scottish titular bishops receiving the Orders of Deacon and Priest may fairly be taken as influenced by one or more of these three arguments: that where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful; that the higher Order includes the lower; that there were examples of consecration to the episcopate *per saltum*. The sketch of the history of the Scottish Reformation which has already been given makes it extremely doubtful whether the titular bishops had ever been ordained by presbyters. It remains almost a certainty that David Lindsay and Andrew Lamb had never received ordination by the hands of anyone, seeing that they were appointed ministers in 1560, when ordination was formally declared unnecessary, and that they were then laymen. And by the same facts of history, it is more than merely probable that those of the titulars who had received the form of ordination had received that form

¹ “Ἦν δέ τις Νεκτάριος ὄνομα, συγκλητικὸν μὲν γένους, ἐπιεικὲς δὲ τὸν τρόπον, δι’ ὅλου θαυμαζόμενος, καίτοι τὴν τοῦ πραιτῶρος χειρίζων ἀρχήν· ὃς ἀρπασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προεβλήθη, τῶν τότε παρόντων ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα ἐπισκόπων χειροτονησάντων αὐτόν.”—Lib. v. cap. 8.

² Sozomen, *H.E.* lib. vii. c. 8.

from men who were not themselves presbyters. The first argument is therefore inapplicable, even if it be regarded as sound. That there were examples of *elevation* to the episcopate *per saltum* is abundantly true, if elevation be understood as election merely; but so far as *consecration* is concerned, it seems clear from what has now been written that the 'leading cases' break down. There remains therefore, as supporting the action of the consecrating bishops, only the argument that the higher Order includes the lower; and this seems quite unimpeachable reasoning. But it is reasoning only; and it is therefore subject to the objection that it is reasoning which is unsupported by practice—and this is a very serious objection. The practice, indeed, is all the other way, ordination to the diaconate and priesthood preceding consecration to the episcopate.

When the episcopate came to be restored to Scotland in 1661, the precedent of 1610 was not followed; and this is significant. Sharpe was consecrated Archbishop of St. Andrews, Fairfoul Archbishop of Glasgow, Hamilton Bishop of Galloway, and Leighton Bishop of Dunblane, the consecrations taking place in London at the hands of the Bishops of London, Worcester, Carlisle, and Llandaff. It is frequently stated that the four Scottish bishops were ordained deacon and priest on the same day, before being advanced to the higher office¹; but this is true of only two of them, Sharpe and Leighton,² the others having been ordained priests in the Scottish Church under the previous episcopate, that of 1610. But when the new bishops returned to Scotland and proceeded to consecrate to other sees, they consecrated *per saltum* in some cases, as in 1610. The fourteen sees were filled in the course of the following year, one of them, Orkney, being occupied by Thomas Sydserff, sole survivor of the former episcopate; but he did not take any part in any of the consecrations. This episcopate survives to the present day in the 'Episcopal Church in Scotland,' which was disestablished in 1689. It is therefore to be frankly noted that, if the episcopate

¹ Wodrow, *History*, vol. i. p. 239.

² Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, vol. i. p. 139.

of 1610, which died out, was under some distrust on the ground of incompleteness through consecration having been *per saltum*, that distrust is theoretically applicable to the present succession in Scotland, though in a very modified degree. The modifying circumstance is that the episcopal succession is comparable to a network rather than to a line. This circumstance operates at the present time in two directions. Most of the Scottish bishops of 1661 were raised through the lower Orders, but a few were raised *per saltum*. Most of the succeeding ordinations were performed by the bishops who had been *per omnia ecclesiastica officia promoti*; and all the succeeding consecrations were accomplished with the help of these bishops. The other direction in which the circumstance operates is this, that in the last half-century many of the Scottish bishops have been of English consecration, while in other cases they have been of English ordination, with English bishops taking part in their consecration.

It must be noted that Scottish Presbyterian churchmen claim that they have a succession through presbyters; but their claim can only be made good—taking it for the moment at their own estimate—through the episcopate which they discarded in 1689. Their recognition of this ought to strengthen the feeling of brotherliness which has arisen in the present generation.

These latter points have a considerable bearing on the question of Reunion. The 'plain man,' or the 'man in the street,' may think that questions of 'Orders' are of no moment: perhaps he is right; many of the first reformers seem to have had this feeling—and they were not unlearned men. Digging into ancient history sometimes brings out facts strangely at variance with our cherished opinions. For example, it upsets our ideas of church order when we learn that a *presbyter* was one of the *consecrators* of a bishop of Rome. It was certainly an unhappy time in the Roman Church, and the indignation against Pope Vigilius was so great that only two bishops could be found willing to consecrate his successor, who had been his deacon. These bishops, John of Perusium and Bonus of Ferentinum,

associated with themselves Andreas, Presbyter of Ostia ; and the three consecrated Pelagius I Bishop of Rome in the year 555.¹ It would sometimes seem as if the predominant idea in ancient minds was continuity of the body corporate rather than succession through individuals.

But what we want at present is to get as near *certainities* as possible, and we are not satisfied with negatives ; we want something positive. The element of uncertainty in the transmission of ecclesiastical Orders may lead back to Bancroft's first argument, and perhaps to Macaulay's famous deliverance on the subject in his essay on ' Gladstone on Church and State '—in which the essayist displayed colossal ignorance of the subject which he handled. But the present trend of ecclesiastical ideas is strongly towards co-operation and co-ordination in work ; and it is seen that these ideas cannot be realized without union, or without a ministry based on the principle of a valid succession, so far as it is humanly possible to safeguard and preserve such a succession. When the question of union between an episcopally governed body and a non-episcopal body shall have arrived at a practical stage—let us say on the basis of the ' Historic Episcopate '—the question of re-ordination will arise ; and this question will be acute if there should be a proposal to raise a member of the non-episcopal body to the episcopate. It is, no doubt, travelling a long way to anticipate these events ; but both the larger and the smaller event will come. For Scotland, the Lambeth Conference seemed to prefer the episcopal period beginning with 1610 ; but this is only in the matter of constitutional government. Yet a claim will be made that the precedent set in the consecrations of that year should govern the episcopate of union ; while the safe precedent is to be found in the consecrations as performed in Westminster Abbey by the English bishops on December 12, 1661.

THOMAS HANNAN.

¹ Bingham, *Antiquities*, bk. ii. cap. 11, § 4 (note), and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, cap. 47.

ART. VIII.—ON CERTAIN ASPECTS OF DIVORCE.

1. *Daphne, or, 'Marriage à la Mode.'* By MRS. HUMPHRY WARD. (London: Cassell and Co. 1909.)
2. *A Modern Chronicle.* By WINSTON CHURCHILL. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1910.)
3. *A Modern Instance.* By WILLIAM D. HOWELLS. Two Volumes. (Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1882.)

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL in 'A Modern Chronicle' begins a chapter with these words: 'It was the poet Cowper who sang of domestic happiness as the only bliss that has survived the Fall. One of the burning and unsolved questions of to-day is—Will it survive the twentieth century?'

Is the newborn Portuguese Republic hurling a defiant answer to this inquiry, in the feverish haste with which it has decreed a divorce law framed on the most accommodating lines, which include desertion, insanity, imprisonment, and mutual consent among just grounds for action? And are the demands of the English advocates of increased facilities (who likewise include desertion and mutual consent in their list of reasonable grounds for the granting of divorce) based on a desire to relegate wedlock to its ancient status of an ordinary civil contract, from which it was transformed by Christianity into a Sacrament; or to maintain it as a Holy Estate, only 'to be taken in hand reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly and in the fear of God?'

In studying the reports of the evidence brought before the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, it is noticeable that those witnesses who prefer to consider marriage in the aspect of a civil contract, seem almost invariably to regard it solely from the point of view of the two partners, leaving out of consideration any of its effects on surrounding kinsfolk and neighbours. Probably this is a suitable attitude to take concerning commercial contracts of partnership. In such cases, if the associated persons cannot conduct their business in mutual harmony,

facilities for the dissolution of partnership are desirable to restore to each his independence, to release them from vexatious restraints, and to set them free to start afresh on separate lines. The general public suffers nothing under the changed conditions, which provide it with a double choice of system and articles of merchandise. But it seems inconceivable that even the blindest doctrinaire can regard these commercial contracts as in any way analogous to marriage contracts. The home is not a shop, existing simply for the conduct of business, furnished with counters and articles for sale. The roots of civilization are entwined with those of its roof-tree; the foundations of the State lie beneath its hearth. The children are not bales of goods to be indifferently allotted to either partner; the family represents no ordinary assets: it lives as the fountain head of the national vital energy. The relations and surrounding circle are not customers, whose bestowal or withdrawal of patronage is merely a matter of monetary importance. They are members of the body politic, who are all affected by the action of each to an incalculable degree. Consequently any degradation of public opinion with regard to the inviolability of the marriage contract must produce national consequences of irreparable disaster 'immediate and remote, individual and general.'

For a warning as to what some of those consequences would be, we may turn to the evidence given before the Divorce Commission by Sir James Crichton Browne, the eminent medical man. He said that

'he was not entitled to an opinion on the subject of divorce generally any more than any other man in the street, but he could not help thinking that instead of allowing greater laxity in divorce, and popularizing it, the sound policy in the long run would be to abolish it altogether, and to hold men and women for good and ill to their matrimonial bargains, however foolish or bad they might be. That there was some lowering and materialization of the conception of marriage was, he thought, indicated by the continuous decrease during the last sixty years of marriages solemnized in places of worship, and by the continuous increase in civil marriages in the office

of the Superintendent Registrar. The abolition of divorce would cause, in many cases, great hardship and misery, but it was expedient that a few hundreds should suffer for the people. There was no principle underlying law more fundamental than the sanctity of contracts, and of all contracts the marriage contract was the most sacred, and should be the most inviolable. Nothing should be done to weaken its obligation or diminish its solemnity, for the easier the annulment was made, the more carelessly would it be covenanted, the less scrupulous would be the observance of those conditions upon which its success and happiness depended. This had, he understood, been found to be the case in those American States in which divorce had been made cheap and easy.¹

The results of this careless covenanting and of the neglect of observance of the conditions upon which success in marriage depends, are strikingly brought out in three novels dealing with the marriage question from the American point of view: *viz.* 'A Modern Instance' by William D. Howells; 'Daphne, or "Marriage à la Mode"' by Mrs. Humphry Ward; and 'A Modern Chronicle' by Winston Churchill.

We are told that Royalty frequents theatres because there alone can it get the nearest outlook (otherwise unattainable) on the ordinary life of ordinary people, untrammelled by the inevitable red carpet, garlands, flags, and festival air which they deem it necessary to wear in the presence of princes. Novel-reading can answer the same useful purpose to persons whose circumstances have sheltered them, by God's mercy, from personal contact with the violent passions and tragedies of life. These three stories are well worth study, because they are not written from an ecclesiastical point of view, but from that of grave-minded lay students of modern tendencies and their effect on human nature; and they unmistakably reveal the alarm with which their writers regard the transformation of the American idea of marriage and the consequent threatened upheaval of the family system.

'Daphne' is a story of slighter workmanship than the

¹ *The Times*, November 2, 1910.

other two ; and we doubt if such a rapid and accumulated torrent of suffering as that which submerged its hero be altogether true to life. But criticism of construction and style is not our concern here. In this article we propose to confine our attention solely to the effect produced by the extension of the grounds for which divorce is procurable, as seen in its influence on those sections of the American social world which are portrayed in these volumes. This limitation will also oblige us to omit all consideration of consequences which might possibly result in England from the provision of provincial Divorce Courts, from lowering the cost of divorce suits, and from placing both sexes on an equality with regard to the grounds for which divorce is granted.

The people who move in and out of the pages of these novels are not abnormal. They possess characteristics which are being developed in alarming profusion by our modern civilization : for example, a love of pleasure, a slackness of moral fibre, with an absence of self-restraint and of noble ideals. Such persons form an important proportion of the population ; consequently, their thoughts and actions exercise a far-reaching influence in the circles they frequent.

Before we pass to the consideration of the life history of the principal actors in these dramas, it may be interesting to speculate on the sort of lives that these three ill-assorted couples would probably have lived had their lot been cast in a period or country where divorce was unattainable. In five cases out of six they would have accepted their fate lazily, cynically or sullenly, according to their various temperaments. They would have sought for consolations, good and evil. But Time, the great healer of discord, would almost certainly have eventually knit them loosely together in links of friendly tolerance ; while we should expect that devoted love, such as that of her husband for Madeleine Verrier, or of his wife for Bartley Hubbard, must have won its triumphant way in the end by sheer persistency.

In a conversation between Mr. Atherton and Ben Halleck in 'A Modern Instance,' during which they mourn

over the miserable conjugal relations of Marcia and Bartley Hubbard, Atherton like a wise philosopher remarked :

“ Married life is as much a mystery to us outsiders as the life to come, almost. The ordinary motives don't seem to count. . . . There 's a great deal in their being bound. They can't live together in enmity, and they must live together. I dare say the offence had merely worn itself out between them.” Halleck assented wearily. “ That isn't my idea of marriage, though.” To which Atherton answered : “ The question is whether it isn't often the fact in regard to such people's marriages.” “ Then they are so many hells,” cried Halleck, “ when self-respect perishes with resentment, and the husband and wife are enslaved to each other. They ought to be broken up.” “ I don't think so,” said Atherton soberly. “ The sort of men and women that marriage enslaves would be vastly more wretched and mischievous if they were set free. I believe that the hell people make for themselves isn't at all a bad place for them. It 's the best place for them. . . . An unhappy marriage isn't the only hell, nor the worst.” “ What could be a worse hell than marriage without love ? ” Halleck demanded fiercely. “ Love without marriage,” said Atherton.

All this is absolutely true. Everything, even unsatisfying marriage, has its compensations ; and it should be remembered that what may look to those outside to be a life's tragedy may nevertheless fall far short of it in reality, because of unknown consolations which alleviate its distresses. Outsiders are hardly in a better position for passing true judgement on the conditions of other people's lives than the alligator, who, looking from his warm water tank in the glass house of the Zoological Gardens on to the outer world beyond, is not qualified to judge of the misery or happiness of the polar bears, whom he sees crouching in the mouth of their frozen den, with the snowstorm beating in upon them.

“ You cannot be unmarried now,” said the Bishop of London the other day, in a remarkable sermon upon “ Life's Second-best.” “ You cannot make up for the mistake of your youth. But at any rate, by the will and by the power of the Holy Spirit you can live such a life of faithfulness, true obedience

and loyalty to the man—or, it may be, the woman—whom you married by mistake, as shall be a real second-best in your life.”¹

But ‘Second-bests’ were not possibilities recognized by the imaginations of Daphne or Honora, the respective heroines of Mrs. Ward’s and Mr. Churchill’s stories; and, therefore, when conjugal happiness began to wear thin, neither of them made the least attempt to transform her marriage into a success, ‘but abandoned the most serious and sacred enterprise in the world as lightly as though it had been a piece of embroidery.’

In both stories the crises arose out of the conditions of the social sets to which the chief actors belonged, sets described by an old-fashioned good woman in Mr. Churchill’s book as

‘so supremely selfish, that if the least difference in taste develops, or if another man or woman chances along whom they momentarily fancy more than their own husbands or wives, they get a divorce. Their idea of marriage is not a mutual sacrifice which brings happiness through trials borne together and through the making of character. They have a notion that man and wife may continue to live their individual lives. That isn’t marriage.’

The sordid immorality which English readers inevitably associate with the idea of divorce is absent from these books. Divorce shews no muddy hoofs, but stalks through them as ‘a demon of salvation assuming an aspect almost benign; not a demon at all but a liberator.’ The soul-destroying results of this liberation are shewn with vivid force in ‘Daphne’ and ‘A Modern Chronicle.’ In both stories we observe the fact that it is the wives and not the husbands who resort to the ‘demon of salvation’ for assistance. This is in accordance with the testimony of American statistics, which shew that in two-thirds of the divorce suits the wives are the plaintiffs. In both stories we find that the wives belong to the tribe of scalp-hunters, a tribe unfertile in the production of domestically minded women. The scalps

¹ *The Guardian*, November 25, 1910.

they collected varied as greatly as did their respective dispositions. In Mrs. Humphry Ward's heroine, Daphne Floyd (the daughter of an Irish lumber-king), 'mingled Celtic and Latin strains with their natural sympathies and repulsions, overlaid by the deposits of the current American world'; from which emerged a character 'steeped in personality so energetic, that it reminded her friends of the passage of a train through the darkness, when, for the moment, the quietest landscape turns to fire and force.' For some of them 'the train had passed—in flame and fury—leaving an echoing silence behind it.' Daphne was inordinately proud of herself as 'the daughter of her own works and efforts,' and as the possessor of measureless power derived from her enormous wealth.

The beautiful and penniless Honora Leffingwell, Mr. Churchill's heroine, was the orphaned daughter of pleasure-loving, extravagant parents. She was brought up by God-fearing, old-fashioned relations, who lavished all their love upon her. Yet on the first opportunity, while yet a school-girl, her hereditary instincts asserted themselves. For, says her author:

'We descendants of rigid Puritans take naturally to a luxury such as the world has never seen—as our right. We have abolished kings, in order that as many of us as possible may abide in palaces. In one day Honora forgot the seventeen years spent in the little house under the hill as though they had never been.'

Her soul was possessed of a hunter's restless energy bent on the pursuit of illusive happiness, luxury and social success, and her eyes were blinded and her ears deafened to all claims of duty and religion.

To these two girls Roger Barnes and Howard Spence came as wooers. Roger was poor, superbly handsome, unintellectual and moulded in the 'persistent type' of the English country gentleman, a type which has given England some of her most stalwart and single-minded sons. Within these unromantic lines Roger had ample possibilities of noble development. Honora's lover stood on a lower plane, although when she first saw him she took him for a

dominating man of affairs, who represented Finance and who, judging by his outward appearance, 'might have stood for the god of Prosperity.' Unfortunately the outward appearance masked a vacuum, empty of all deep feelings and aspirations, but which the years were contemptuously filling with trash and dregs, with self-conceit and aggressiveness.

Such were the men to whom Daphne and Honora surrendered themselves in marriage; Daphne, because she had fallen in love with her Apollo; Honora, because she wanted to live in Paradise; and Paradise, according to her interpretation, signified New York. Their extravagant girlish expectations soon suffered the inevitable disillusion which always awaits such dreams. Whereupon both heroines instinctively turned for relief to Divorce, as unhesitatingly as ordinary people, when suffering from toothache, turn to the dentist and laughing gas.

The arguments in favour of this repudiation of their wifely obligations are presented in nearly the same words in both books. Hugh Chiltern, Honora's lover, pleads successfully to her:

'We have each of us but one life to live. . . . We are no longer in the dark ages. Everyone, man or woman, has the right to happiness. There is no reason why we should suffer all our lives for a mistake.'

Daphne expounds her views in passionate assertion that:

'We know too well that there's only one life, and we don't mean to have that one spoilt. The old notions of marriage—your English notions—make it tyranny! Why should people stay together when they see it's a mistake? We say everybody shall have their chance, and not one chance only, but more than one.'

In the midnight, wrestling with her conscience, when she had hardened herself to her irrevocable purpose, she silenced its pleadings by repeating her fierce belief that 'My first duty is to myself—to my own development! We have absolutely no right to sacrifice ourselves—as women have been taught to do for thousands of years.'

Jealousy was the gad-fly that drove Daphne across the Atlantic to South Dakota, where, after pouring out torrents of gold on perjured witnesses and other instruments, she obtained her decree of divorce on a false charge of 'Cruelty and Indignities.' Honora, obsessed by an overwhelming passion for Hugh Chiltern, after a year's exile to Salomon City, won hers on the ground of what was euphemistically described as 'Desertion.' And thus released from the shackles of matrimony, each woman was set free to make her second attempt to enter the gate of Paradise after the example of her countrywoman, the immortal Mrs. Hominy, 'in a procession of One.'

The threatening presence of 'ruin and death, of things damning and irrevocable,' darkened the air without the gate, where their repudiated husbands lingered. They were men whose moral disintegration was precipitated by such upheaval of all their silent forces of habit and custom of marriage, by a blow so 'confounding to the human conscience.' The effect on Roger Barnes was described with brutal frankness to his wife by her old friend Captain Boyson. He told her in their talk beside the Falls of Niagara, that her husband had lost health, character, happiness, his child, his home, everything, owing to her action; and that by her action she had murdered a life given to her in trust by God. To a man of the stamp of Howard Spence, whose moral and emotional qualities were quite undeveloped, the catastrophe did not come with the same violence as to Roger. It merely robbed him of his 'one chance' of evolving a soul capable of probity, love, and self-sacrifice. He died of a complication of maladies in suspicious circumstances under indictment as President of a Trust Company. In both cases the new charter (so fiercely proclaimed by Daphne, Honora, and their friends), of 'Everyone's Right to Happiness,' was cruelly violated by the 'demon of salvation,' whose partial judgement appears to have been given with sole regard to the wives' happiness. These results may reasonably cause us to doubt whether universal happiness would be the invariable outcome in a world where divorce facilities were benevolently placed within reach of the ficklest and

poorest of its sons and daughters ; and whether American statistics—which shew that one marriage in every fifteen is ultimately dissolved ; that in 1900 there were 73 divorces per 100,000 (while in England the proportion was 2 per 100,000) ; and that from 1890-1900 the rate of increase of divorce throughout the States was three times greater than that of population¹—can be quoted as proofs that easy divorce produces national happiness or indeed any other desirable national condition.

In 'Daphne' an American correspondent is quoted as saying that passion is not responsible for most of these divorces, but

'an everspreading restlessness and levity, a readiness to tamper with the very foundations of society, for a whim, for nothing !—in the interests of what women call their "individuality" ! . . . The facilities are always there, and the temptation of them. The women, especially, who do these things are moral anarchists.' The writer adds : 'They seem to pay no penalty. But there are divine avenging forces in the very law they tamper with—and as a nation [America] must either retrace some of the steps taken, or sink in the scale of life.'²

Did Daphne Barnes and Honora Spence pay no penalties ? The development of the situation as it affected them contains the great lesson of the two books. We left them attempting to enter Paradise. Did they succeed in their attempt ?

Among many varying descriptions of Paradise, we have never yet come across any that pictured it as a land of dripping fog, pierced by the threatening roar of unseen waterfalls, where wandering forms passed to and fro, shrouded from each other by the isolating mist. The account of Daphne at Niagara reads like an allegory, revealing the state of her spiritual desolation under the description of her physical dreariness. A sterile life, soured by bitter

¹ See the evidence given by Mr. R. N. Cram, Member of the American Federal Bar and Chancellor of Missouri Diocese, before the Royal Commission on Divorce, *The Times*, June 30, 1910.

² P. 258.

introspections and irritable pride, thoughts fed on 'a diet of egotism and falsehoods,' a mind occupied with the advocacy of feminist 'causes' on militant platforms, hungry for adulation but starved of tender human sympathies—such was the consummation of bliss to which Daphne's final venture had brought her. She had missed the gate of Paradise and, instead, had strayed into a barren land of clouds and darkness. Her friend Madeleine Verrier (killed by the haunting remorse that followed the suicide of her husband) left a death-bed letter for Daphne. She wrote :

"It was I who first taught you that we may follow our own lawless wills, and that marriage is something we may bend or break as we will. But oh ! it is not so. Marriage is mysterious and wonderful ; it is the supreme test of men and women. If we wrong it, and despise it, we mutilate the divine in ourselves."

The vision of Daphne, brooding over her dead friend's message in tragic desolation, seems to shew that, in her case, the liberating demon had blundered and had directed her steps to Purgatory instead of to Paradise.

Lonely desolation was not the fate which awaited Honora. Her path led her into an Elysium of lath and plaster, peopled by gay crowds who disported themselves hither and thither without interrupting the romance of her devoted intercourse with Hugh Chiltern. In her dazzled eyes the cardboard palaces and revellers glittered with unearthly beauty in the glare of the rose-coloured lights. 'Reality became unreality' to her, as she beheld the wonderful enchantment unroll itself before her.

"The desert and its journey fell away." She wondered whether "such a thing could, after all, be possible ? Did fate deal twice to those whom she had made novices ? The mirage, indeed, suddenly became reality . . . a Paradise regained. Why Paradise regained ? Paradise gained. She had never known it until he [Hugh Chiltern] had flung wide the gates . . . Love was the word that rang out, as one calling through the garden, and her thoughts ran molten. Let love overflow—She gloried in the waste ! And let the lean years come,—She defied them."

Her delicious dreams were but little disturbed at first by the echoes from the gay crowd which reached her from time to time ; sometimes in words, such as Mr. Cecil Grainger's remarks on the fact that, despite appearances, American *divorcées* could not

"keep their cake and eat it too." "It doesn't pay. When you're divorced and married again, you've got to keep up appearances—the first time you don't. Some of these people are working pretty hard." And again: "The fact is, divorce is going out of fashion—maybe it's been a bit overdone. Most people who have tried it have discovered that the fire is no better than the frying pan—both hot as soon as they warm up."

Sometimes the echoes were shouted to her in the shape of horrible newspaper paragraphs commenting upon her own and Chiltern's past careers. Her lover bade Honora recollect that these odious words could not hurt them, because

'their love was too sacred to be soiled and too perfect to be troubled. As for himself, she knew he was a changed man, who thought of his former life with loathing. She had made him clean and filled him with a new strong life.'

They married as soon as the decree was pronounced ; and Honora thought that—

'If she lived henceforth in fear of God, He would let her keep this priceless love which had come to her. It was impossible that He should regard it as an inordinate and sinful affection—since it had filled her life with light.'

In the closing chapters of the book we watch the extinguishing of that light and the coming of a 'sense of fear and of irreparable loss' to Honora, as the compassionate eyes of the family servant, Chiltern's old butler, watched the developing tragedy. We watch her husband's infuriated anger at the alienation of neighbours and old friends. We watch Honora's ceaseless efforts to fan the drooping flame

of his love. We watch her gradual awakening to the loss of his love and

‘to a sense of loneliness colder than the space between the worlds. . . . “We have the right to happiness,” he had said. . . . “What was this strange elusive happiness, that she had so pantingly pursued and never overtaken? Ecstasy, perhaps, she had found—or was it delirium? Fear was the boon companion of these; or better, the pestilence that stalked behind them, ever ready to strike.” Through all her musing she was possessed with one fearful supreme fact, “the wreck of Chiltern breaking against the rocks, driven there by her.” “That he should crumble was,” she felt, “the greatest of her punishments.”’

We see at the end Chiltern filling her house with a party of fast guests, some of the unclean restless crew which she so deeply loathed; and Honora in horror facing the future in the knowledge that ‘her soul would not be able to survive the process of steady degradation to which it was sure to be subjected.’ And then the light goes out in Chiltern’s violent sudden death and the consequent deliverance of Honora from perdition. If Daphne’s purgatory was glacial, Honora’s was savage with tempest and whirlwinds.

Two other actors in marriage tragedies flit through the stories. The ghost-ridden Madeleine Verrier drove a husband passionately devoted to her into suicide on account of her impending divorce. Her mother had loathed the marriage, and had eagerly seized on the first symptoms of ennui and discontent in Madeleine to persuade her to divorce the son-in-law she detested so fiercely. And in ‘The Modern Chronicle’ we meet the portentous Adèle Rindge, an immature-looking heiress of twenty-two, who had contrived, ‘in the comparatively brief time since she had reached the supposed age of discretion, to marry two men and build two houses and incidentally to see a considerable portion of what is known as the world.’ She had divorced her first husband because ‘Adèle’s dea of existence was a steeplechase with nothing but water-jumps, and his to loiter around in a gypsy van and sit in the sun.’ But as soon as she married her second husband, she found that she had fallen madly in love with

her first ; and in reckless despair tried to ride 'Oblivion,' the horse that killed Chiltern, because she was 'reckless—with a purpose.'

Desolation, deterioration, ruin, disease, despair, suicide, death—such are the grim attendants who, according to these stories, accompany the frequenters of the American Divorce Courts, when they sally forth through the well-oiled doors to return once more to their world of riches and pleasure.

" 'With this license at our gates,' the American naval captain complained in 'Daphne,' "no one is safe ; and thousands of our women, in particular, are going to the deuce, simply because they have the opportunity of going." "

Mr. Atherton in the 'Modern Instance' describes these women's tempters as

'scoundrels who lure women from their duty, ruin homes, and destroy society, not in the old libertine fashion in which the seducer had at least the grace to risk his life, but safely, smoothly, under the shelter of our infamous laws. . . . conditions that tempt people to marry with a mental reservation, and that weaken every marriage bond with the guilty hope of escape whenever a fickle mind, or secret lust, or wicked will may dictate.'

No space is left in which to speak of the fine teaching contained in Mr. Howells' book. While the two other stories are primarily concerned in demonstrating the effect of easy divorce upon the minds and souls of women, his story depicts with masterly skill the deterioration of a man's character. It shews how cheap views of marriage and ill-advised reveries on 'contingencies of which a man does not permit himself even to think without a degree of moral disintegration,' paved the way, in the case of Bartley Hubbard, to his divorce suit and its abominable abuses perpetrated in the name of the evasive plea of 'Desertion.'

It is to be feared that America is not the only country where 'the belief in marriage as an institution ordained of God decreed to continue till death dissolves it, and in its relations typifying and perpetuating many holy ideas, has

become weakened during the last century along with a weakening of other religious conceptions.' There are many threatening signs which should make us fear, that if an extension of divorce facilities, plausibly demanded in the interests of an unhappy minority, were granted to us here in England, their demoralizing effect on the great majority would be found far to outweigh any of the benefits which, it is pleaded, they would confer on a certain percentage of ill-mated couples.

'Too easy divorce would encourage experimental marriage,' said Mr. John Rose, the Metropolitan Police Magistrate in his evidence before the Divorce Commission.¹ 'We derived great advantage from the firmness of the marriage tie in England; and the poorer classes were by no means indifferent to the binding nature of marriage.' Only last week the writer was informed that in one of our largest provincial cities, a motherly working woman implored a friend to do all in her power 'to stop this Divorce being made easy for us.' She continued: 'The girls in the low part of the town are all talking about it, and saying how glad they are, because now they will be able to sample marriage, and if they don't like it—they can chuck it!'

If this spirit of levity is infecting the future wives of England, the opinion expressed in his evidence before the same Commission by the chief constable of Hull² does not exaggerate the gravity of the danger. He said that in his opinion: 'Divorce for desertion would ruin the national character. The sanctity of marriage was the greatest national asset we had got.'

LAURA E. RIDDING.

¹ *The Times*, March 2, 1910.

² *The Times*, March 19, 1910.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—BIBLICAL AND KINDRED STUDIES.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles.

By E. L. CURTIS, PH.D., D.D. 'International Critical Commentary.' (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1910.) 12s.

THE appearance of Dr. Curtis' volume supplies a need which has long been felt by Biblical students, and will accordingly be warmly welcomed. Readers of this work will keenly sympathize with the writer in the sad and sudden misfortune which, as he tells us in his Preface, has so seriously affected his eyesight. In such circumstances the temptation to relinquish the unfinished task must have been great; but Dr. Curtis has bravely carried it through, with the assistance of Dr. Madsen, to whom is due, among other sections of the book, the full and useful list of characteristic phrases in Chronicles, contained in § 7 of the Introduction.

The task of writing a commentary on Chronicles is by no means an easy one. A tendency writing of so pronounced a character, of which the outlook upon past history is, in the main, so manifestly unhistorical, requires very full and detailed introductory treatment, in order to make clear to the reader the writer's religious standpoint, and his relation to the thought of his time. The 'plan, purpose, and historical value' of Chronicles are dealt with in the Introduction, § 4, and the section takes the form of a survey of the main events of each king's reign, with brief indication of the statements which illustrate the writer's special purpose. What the reader misses is some account of the condition of religious belief and worship under the monarchy as pictured in the Books of Samuel and Kings, as a preliminary to a description of the Chronicler's interpretation of the religious history of this period from his post-exilic priestly standpoint; in order that the contrast between the early and late narratives may be brought into bold relief. It is unfortunate that the treatment of 'the religious value' of Chronicles (§ 8 of the Introduction) occupies little more than a single page; since it is here, if anywhere, that the work must justify itself as part of the Canonical Scriptures. In the commentary the notes are brief, but generally

adequate; though the reader has frequently to rest content with a mere reference to an authority where some discussion of the question at issue might have been expected. Thus, for example, with regard to Millo (1 Chron. xi. 8) the only note is 'part of the fortifications of Jerusalem: location and meaning are obscure,' and the reader is referred to Dr. G. A. Smith's discussion in his work on Jerusalem. So, again, on 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23, it does not help the reader much to be told that 'the historicity of any decree upon the part of Cyrus for the return and rebuilding of the Temple has been questioned,' without a short statement of the grounds upon which the writers to whom reference is given base their incredulity.

Isaias. Diligenter revisus juxta Massorah atque Editiones principes cum variis lectionibus e MSS. atque antiquis Versionibus collectis a C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D. (Londinii: sumptibus Societatis Bibliophilorum Britannicae et Externae. MCMIX.) IS.

WHEN the British and Foreign Bible Society decided—wisely or not—that their new issue of the Hebrew Bible, of which this is the second¹ instalment, should possess an elaborate *apparatus criticus* of the Massorah, they were fortunate in securing the services of an acknowledged authority highly eminent in this branch of study. The extent of Dr. Ginsburg's work may be gathered from the fact that for a total of 1753 lines of text there are no fewer than 1471 lines of footnotes, notwithstanding that the latter are in smaller type with narrower margin. These notes (entirely in Hebrew save for the verse-numerals) consist of various Massoretic readings from a collection of over seventy MSS., nearly twenty editions, and some half-dozen versions. These sources are enumerated at the beginning of the book, each being indicated by Hebrew characters. It will seem rather strange at first to think of the Septuagint as 'Tau-Ayin' or the Vulgate as 'Tau-Resh'; but such nomenclature is not unsuitable here, and it gives to the printed page a thoroughly Hebraic, even a Jewish, appearance. Indeed the work is in some respects very Jewish, and will commend itself to members of that Faith, who cannot fail to admire the loving exactness and devoted painstaking shewn by Dr. Ginsburg in getting together this

¹ The first was the Pentateuch, published a couple of years ago.

wonderful array of Massoretic jots and tittles. Christian readers may be somewhat dubious. They will perhaps re-echo the wish expressed by Professor Eberhard Nestle for a Hebrew Bible printed like this,¹ but provided with the critical notes given in R. Kittel's deservedly popular edition. We could wish, too, that even in the printing one feature of that edition were present here—the stichometrical spacing of poetry. The new Bible cannot possibly replace Kittel's so far as serious Old Testament study is concerned. Yet few students will like to be without Ginsburg's on their shelf. The book is admirably printed on a page measuring $11\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ inches. The print is very black and the paper is very white. It will be difficult to find a handsomer Hebrew Bible when the work is complete and suitably bound.

Space will not permit detailed consideration. One feature, however, should be specially commended. Where the Q^{eri} differs from the K^{tib} the consonants of the latter are left unpointed. This is all to the good, for occasionally the Q^{eri} vowels give to the K^{tib} consonants a weird appearance, causing dismay to an inexperienced reader who has not noticed the circlet telling him to consult the margin. The case is different with the divine name YHWH, for here a Q^{eri perpetuum} is always observed. In all other cases Dr. Ginsburg puts the vowels in a footnote, following the practice he began in his earlier Massoretic edition for the Trinitarian Bible Society. Undoubtedly this is the right way, and we hope all future editions of the Hebrew Bible will follow it.

As to the actual value of the multitudinous notes, although the mass of detail seems sometimes to prompt the question, 'To what purpose is this waste?'—reflection may suggest the answer that such an edition as this is well worth doing after all. Modern critics are apt to make short work of the Massoretic text; but since it can never safely be neglected let us welcome this new Bible, based as it is on the text of Rabbi Yaqōb-ben-Hayyim, first printed by Bomberg at Venice in 1524, and now enriched by the great collation displayed to our view by Dr. Ginsburg. It is a suggestive fact that to-day, when the dogma of Verbal Inspiration is quite discredited, an edition like this should be put in hand under Christian auspices. It proves that in spite of a

¹ *Expository Times*, April 1900. Dr. Nestle was alluding to the Pentateuch. The pages in Isaiah present a still better appearance owing to the larger type used for the notes. The entire Bible is to be uniform with Isaiah.

century and a half of steadily advancing and constantly widening criticism, the interest in the *ipsissima verba* of the Old Testament text from which the English version has been translated remains unshaken, even though we realize that these *verba*, with all the variations, often so very minute, found in the MSS., do but represent the traditions of Synagogues.

The Yalkut of R. Machir Bar Abba Mari on Zechariah. Edited, for the first time, from the unique MS. (Harley, 5704) in the British Museum, by A. W. GREENUP, D.D., Principal of St. John's College, Highbury. (London. Privately printed. 1909.) 4s. net.

DR. GREENUP has placed scholars under a further debt of gratitude by his publication of this second instalment of the *Yalkut ha-Machiri*; it was only quite recently that he published the portion on Hosea. Rabbi Machir lived, most probably, in the fourteenth century; his work is in the nature of something corresponding to a *Catena* of patristic quotations in the Christian Church. The word 'Yalkut' comes from a root meaning 'to gather'; and a work is so called because it is a compilation of quotations from earlier authorities. In the present case the compiler has gathered a number of sayings and comments from the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds, from the Tosephta (*i.e.* a collection independent of the Mishna, but gathered from the same material as that embodied in the Mishna), and from a number of Midrashic works, the most important being *Sifra* (a Midrash on Leviticus), *Sifre* (a Midrash on Numbers and Deuteronomy), and *Pesikta* (a Midrash on the lessons from the Pentateuch and the Prophets). This *Yalkut* partakes of the same character as the earlier and more important *Yalkut Shimeoni*; but while the latter contains quotations in reference to all the books of the Bible, the work of Rabbi Machir deals only with the prophetic books, and Psalms, Proverbs, and Job. In the portion of this work under consideration the author goes through the book of Zechariah verse by verse, giving under each the comments and explanations which he has gathered from the earlier works just referred to; these are noted in the margin in each case. The value of the work is twofold; in the first place, as Dr. Greenup says in his introduction, 'for purposes of textual criticism the *Yalkut Machiri* is of high value. It is evident that of several of the Midrashim quoted the compiler had more than

one manuscript, and that different recensions of the text were represented. No one who wishes to investigate the textual problems of the *Yalkut Shimeoni* can afford to neglect the light thrown on them by a comparison of texts with those of Machir.' In the second place, among the Biblical extracts there are a large number in which the text varies from that of the Hebrew Bible. Many of these are, no doubt, due to scribal errors and to the fact that passages were quoted from memory; but, while allowing for these, there are still many instances in which the variations are due to something else. Are they ancient echoes which have been handed down from the time prior to the rigid fixing of the Biblical text by the Massoretes? The question cannot be answered off-hand; the possibility of an affirmative answer is not excluded when it is remembered how tenaciously ancient traditions are clung to in Rabbinical writings. At any rate, such work as Dr. Greenup offers in editing these old-world texts will be highly appreciated by those who realize the various directions in which they can be utilized; there are few men so well equipped to undertake the task as he is, and his labour of love has been admirably executed.

Documents of Jewish Sectaries. By S. SCHECHTER. Two volumes. (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 10s. net.

IN these handsomely printed volumes Dr. Schechter introduces to Hebrew students two groups of fragments discovered in the Cairo Genizah, whose treasures are being gradually unfolded to the world. The works of which these fragments form a part have been hitherto unknown; and on this account facsimiles of sheets are given with a view to facilitate identification in case search among Genizah material should bring to light fresh fragments.

The first volume contains what is designated by Dr. Schechter *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. From the contents of these fragments we gather that the original book consisted of two parts, the first dealing with historical and doctrinal matters, the second with subjects of an halakic or legal character. The glimpses we catch of the history of the sect shew us that its peculiar opinions caused its separation from the bulk of the Jewish nation; that its adherents left Judah for the north, ultimately settling at Damascus, where its teacher died but was expected to rise again. The sect was constituted of four estates,

Levites, Priests, Israelites and Proselytes; and amongst its officers we find a Censor (*mebakker*), an office otherwise unknown in Judaism.

The fragments make it clear that the sect accepted the Canon of the Old Testament, and also considered as sacred certain external writings, amongst which were the *Book of Jubilees*, quoted by name (p. 16), the *Testament of Levi* (p. 4), and some pseudepigrapha now lost (pp. 5, 8). One work is named of which we have no further knowledge, the *Book of the Hagu* (? = 'meditation'), which may have contained an account of the teachings of the sect, as it was necessary that 'the judges of the congregation' should be learned in it. Thus the sect, by accepting pseudepigrapha as authoritative, is distinguished from the Pharisees; and by accepting the whole of the Old Testament, from the Samaritans, the most ancient of sects in Israel. Their regulation of the calendar also separated them both from Jew and from Samaritan, and this is one of the most important points in which the schism shewed itself. The polemics of the sect were particularly directed against the Pharisees, who are spoken of in language which is not at all complimentary, and who are charged with fornication because of their practice of polygamy. It is in this connexion that David is condemned, 'for he read not in the Book of the Law . . . which was hidden and not discovered till Zadok arose' (p. 5).

Of such a sect as the one described above Jewish history contains no record. But an Arabic writer, Kirkisani, who wrote about 637, tells us that 'Zadok was the first who exposed the Rabbanites, and contradicted them publicly'; and in his account of the followers of Zadok he mentions two laws which are peculiar to them. These are the ones named in our fragments: the prohibition of divorce and polygamy, and the regulation of the calendar. On this account Dr. Schechter thinks that our fragments are from a Zadokite book known to us chiefly from Kirkisani. The doctrines of the sect have points of contact with the Dositheans and with the Falashas; and it is not improbable that the Zadokites carried on missionary work from Damascus amongst the inhabitants of Egypt and of southern Palestine. Perhaps the Zadokites were absorbed by the Dositheans, who in turn were absorbed by the Samaritans. The Falashas alone preserve some traces of Zadokite thought and practice.

Dr. Schechter gives a careful translation of the text with footnotes suggesting emendations and explaining the more

difficult passages. He is conscious that work on such fragments can only lead to tentative conclusions, and whether or no the hypothesis he offers is correct, we at any rate are strengthened by his researches in the conviction that it is amongst sects severed from the general body of Judaism that we must look for the origin of many pseudepigraphic works.

The texts contained in the second volume are fragments of the Book of the Commandments by Anan. They contain nothing of interest to the general reader, and the lacunae are so many that even the general sense of some passages is doubtful. Dr. Schechter has attempted no translation, nor any analysis of what is presented to us. In his preface he says: 'These fragments are certainly in need of a commentary, but this task must be left to specialists such as Dr. Poznanski, who, I hope, will furnish us with an essay bearing on their relation to the works of other early Karaitic writers.' Dr. Poznanski's unique knowledge of Karaitic literature will undoubtedly throw much light on these fragments, and we look forward with interest to his study of them.

The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism. By T. J. THORBURN, D.D., LL.D. (Kegan Paul. 1910.) 5s. net.

DR. THORBURN has given us a very interesting book. Ostensibly a criticism of Dr. Schmiedel's article on the Resurrection Narratives in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, it is really a great deal more than that; for it deals carefully with all the evidence for the Resurrection afforded by the Canonical Gospels and 1 Corinthians, and incidentally meets objections which have been raised by critics of all ages from Celsus to Dr. Cheyne. The Appendices also contain much that is valuable. English readers will be grateful to Dr. Thorburn for marshalling the evidence of extra-canonical sources, which is not always easy to obtain, and for summing up the various critical theories which have been framed to get rid of the belief in a real, objective Resurrection of our Lord.

Those who come with an open mind to this study cannot fail to be impressed with the steady, consistent witness to the fact of the Resurrection. As to what is told them of the manner of it and of the proofs of it given to various people, they must not be disappointed to find the same difficulty which Thucydides felt in writing the history of his own time: even undoubted eye-witnesses are not always agreed about what they themselves have

seen. Personally we think that many writers make too much of the discrepancies in the Resurrection stories. We agree, for example, with Dr. Thorburn that 'we know' (οἶδαμεν) in St. John xx. 2, points to the presence of a company of women like that described in the Synoptists, and with Mr. Blair that St. Luke's words, 'And told all these things to the Eleven and to all the rest' (xxiv. 9), are not utterly contradictory of St. Mark's, 'Neither said they anything to any man; for they were afraid' (xvi. 8).

Our criticism of Dr. Thorburn's book turns mostly on small points. We think that St. Luke need not necessarily have known of the Galilaean appearances when he wrote the Gospel. He may have had before him then an incomplete account, which led him, apparently, also to put the Resurrection and Ascension on the same day—a view which he afterwards corrected in the Acts. As regards the appearance to St. James, the account given in the Gospel according to the Hebrews looks like a mosaic formed out of the Gospels and the statement of St. Paul—it cannot rank as an independent testimony—and, even if the word 'twelve' (δώδεκα) be a gloss in St. Luke xxii. 14, it is certainly an integral part of St. Mark xiv. 17. James, the Lord's brother, was clearly not a disciple before the Resurrection, but was no less clearly a disciple afterwards (Acts i. 14). The reason for the change is to be found in 'He was seen of James' (ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ).

We cannot take St. Matt. xii. 40 as a copyist's addition. It belongs to the text and is probably due to the editor of the Gospel, who misunderstood what the sign of Jonah was, and wished to find Old Testament authority for the Resurrection. In discussing the alleged historical discrepancies between the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians, Dr. Thorburn has not made allowance for difference of motive in the two authors: St. Luke wrote what was of interest for the history of the Church, St. Paul what served to prove his own independence. Nor has he noticed how St. Paul's idea of the Resurrection Body developed from the almost material view of 1 Cor. vi. 12-20 to the highly spiritual view of 1 Cor. xv. with its decisive 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,' which Dr. Thorburn might have quoted. Once more, in treating of the words of our Lord to Martha (St. John xi. 25-26), he does not realize that our Lord is there going beyond the formal doctrine of the Resurrection from the dead, and asserting the truth that, for the believer, eternal life is immediate and continuous (a favourite thought of the Fourth Evangelist, St. John v. 24; xvii. 3).

We notice two mistakes—one on page 30, where St. Luke iv. 8

is given as authority for the rebuking of our Lord by St. Peter (St. Luke says nothing of this); and the other on page 55, where St. Luke is said to detail 'at some length the gift of these [spiritual] powers at the time of the Ascension.' These are blemishes which should be expunged.

Anni Domini: a Gospel Study. By MABEL M. LINDSAY. Two volumes. (Methuen.) 10s. net.

THIS admirable book entirely fulfils the purpose for which it was undertaken, *i.e.* to supply an aid to the intelligent reading of the Gospels for people who had not previously been interested in studying them. Moreover, the writer's extensive acquaintance with the most modern orthodox authorities renders available to the general public a very large amount of enlightenment, drawn not only from books, but also from the not less valuable contributions to knowledge that are found in the leading journals of sacred study. It is a compendium of what, up to the date of writing, is known and written about the Gospel history, without entering unduly upon the questions raised by the more destructive critics. The writer very wisely indeed (while modestly expressing doubts as to her capacity for doing so) continues the record through the period of the Acts of the Apostles down to the sub-Apostolic Age, stating the generally received views as to the authorship and origin of the books of the New Testament, and also of the great Creeds of the Church and of the Athanasian Hymn.

The book should be widely known among both teachers and students, and the existing drawbacks to this removed as soon as possible. We allude to the size and price. Till it is issued in a smaller and much cheaper form, it cannot hope for the wide circulation that it merits.

II.—PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND APOLOGETICS.

The Attitude of Science towards Miracles. By H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc. 'Transactions of the Victoria Institute.' (London: Victoria Institute).

THIS essay obtained the Gunning Prize in 1909, and was read at the Victoria Institute on January 24 of last year. In it the author, after a preliminary discussion of the terms 'Science' and 'Miracle,' proceeds to ask the questions whether, from the

scientific standpoint, Miracles (1) are possible, (2) are probable, (3) have actually occurred. These questions are answered in the affirmative, and we agree with the answer, but we could wish that the author had adopted the positive rather than the negative method. There is too much said of the objections brought by scientists or pseudo-scientists against the credibility of miracles in general and particular, too little reasoned treatment of the subject on a strictly scientific basis: and we cannot agree with Professor Orchard that the existence of counterfeited miracles necessarily proves the existence of the thing counterfeited. All that it does prove is the readiness of the human mind to accept the miraculous—which few will be prepared to deny. We think also that Professor Orchard is a little too lavish in his quotations. They form a long chain throughout the essay, but they are of very various worth, and they do not carry conviction by sheer weight of numbers. Nor does he seem to realize the great distance which separates the evidence (say) for the miraculous events of the Exodus from that for the Resurrection of our Lord. The Gospels and the earliest narratives of the Old Testament cannot be regarded as standing on the same plane of credibility in regard to the facts which they record: the institution of the Passover may well be a memorial of the Exodus, but it does not therefore prove the miracles which are associated with it.

The discussion which followed the essay is instructive as shewing what irrelevant arguments can be used by men whose minds are already made up. One speaker (who might, with advantage, read Bishop Stubbs' *Ordination Addresses*, p. 47) claimed special credence for the Miracles related in the Acts on the ground of the remarkable accuracy shewn by St. Luke in his use of titles and geographical details, and the author himself seemed to think that the fact that St. Paul disputed 'daily in the school of one Tyrannus' was a proof of his influence upon the cultivated classes.

Existence after Death implied by Science. By JASPER B. HUNT, M.A., B.D. (H. R. Allenson. 1910.) 5s. net.

THE writer of this book has explained in his Preface the thesis which he wishes to establish, 'namely, that science, regarded in the gross, dictates the spirituality of man, and strongly implies a spiritual destiny for individual human beings.' For this purpose he has 'placed the notion of human continuance after

death side by side with what appear to be relevant (or antagonistic) positions in modern science, and tested one religious belief by the canons thus supplied.' So far as is possible, he has kept God out of the argument, because to believe in God is to believe in immortality; and, taking up modern scientific positions one after another, even those which he cannot himself adopt, he claims to have proved that belief in a future life, so far from being inconsistent with them, is rather strengthened and developed by the conclusions to which they point. His argument is not easy to summarize, for, as he says, his book is rather a series of notes than a consecutive treatise; but some of the most salient points are these. Every day one hears the appeal made, even by unbelievers who would reject the idea of a future life beginning on earth, that men should live a 'higher' life, a life other than that of the natural animal. But with this 'other life' principle the belief in a future life is bound with an indissoluble bond, and the faith which is demanded for the latter is just as evidently required for the former. The idea that men can have perfect knowledge is futile: most of the root principles adopted by humanity are incapable of proof. Moreover, any statement of human nature which affects to regard it as purely physical is void and barren. This is so, even on a materialist's hypothesis; and, when we find the same materialist daring to urge men to deny themselves for others, we receive a still more cogent argument for the belief that man is Spirit: on his own principles the materialist has no right to recommend such a course. It looks as if 'in evolution's long run, not so much matter had bequeathed life as spirit had expressed itself in substance.'

Once more, whatever the advance of knowledge, the Universe does still remain anthropocentric, the gulf between man and other animals remains unbridged, the mystery of the soul is still unsolved. The superiority of man on the one side and the cosmic strife on the other go to form the conclusion that 'Nature is moral if man is immortal,' and not otherwise.

After a chapter devoted to a discussion of the 'sub-conscious' and of the proof which it may possibly afford of our membership in a Spirit Universe, and therefore of our claim to immortality, the writer ends with a brief survey of the circulation of the After-life idea among various classes of people, who by glad acceptance, or by bitter hostility, or (still more) by reluctant submission, testify to its unassailable hold on men.

The book is exceedingly interesting, and we hope that it will be read as it deserves to be. For it is written, not from the

standpoint of the Christian apologist who is painfully anxious to save what he can from the wreck of his creed before the next wave of science comes and sweeps it all away, but from the standpoint of a thinker to whom truth is one, and who, though not a professed scientist himself, moves easily in the writings of scientists, and can sympathize even when he does not agree with their conclusions. Mr. Hunt never takes a party advantage of their discordant voices : he hopefully faces the question—' What is the future of this doctrine, even if the most advanced materialist can make good his position ? ' and he has no fear as to the answer.

On one page he speaks of the duty which lies upon him to be brief and plain. Brief he may be, but plain, never. Obscurity is the one blemish in his book. It is a pity that he should sometimes, especially in the earlier chapters, stoop to a style that is gritty and disagreeable, when at his best he is a master of real eloquence.

Religious Beliefs of Scientists. By ARTHUR H. TABRUM. With an Introduction by Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A. (Hunter and Longhurst. 1910.) 2s. 6d. net.

THIS is a series of answers given by men of science to two questions put to them by Mr. Tabrum : (1) Is there any real conflict between the facts of Science and the fundamentals of Christianity ? (2) Has it been your experience to find men of science irreligious and anti-Christian ?

Some of the answers were written as far back as fourteen years ago, many are comparatively recent. But the majority of them give a clear denial to both questions : and we are assured that the compiler has not kept back any that he might have published, nor edited any part of those which he has given to the world. The reason for the compilation is to be found in the lectures and writings of Mr. McCabe and others of his school, who use language about the opposition between Science and Christianity which is not warranted by the facts : the truth being that there is no essential incompatibility between the two, but only between claims made in their behalf, or between the facts of the one and a false presentment of the other. Moreover, the true scientific spirit is itself religious, because it is a spirit of humility ; and, if some men of science are Agnostic, so are a good many other people. Belief and unbelief are due as much to character as to any particular study.

This is the net result of the book which, to speak plainly, is

tedious reading. Even scientists may be irrelevant, and their answers do not always bear directly on the questions. Sometimes, too, their anxiety to disclaim the innuendo of the rationalists leads them into exaggeration, as when Professor Hull says that 'as regards the truth and authenticity of the historical books—every day's discovery tends to confirm them, and recent investigations in Egypt, Palestine, and other Eastern countries have shown how, even in minor details, the documents of the Old Testament may be accepted with implicit confidence.' For our own part, though we have every sympathy with the patient and exhaustive labour of Mr. Tabrum, we cannot see how the book is to help matters. Mr. McCabe will probably not read it: certainly none of the audience whom his lecturers address in Victoria Park will read it. The only people who are likely to read it are those who are already convinced of the untruth of these cheap accusations, and who feel—with Professor Boyd Dawkins, Sir Dyce Duckworth, and an unnamed Professor of Zoology—that it is not worth while to attach any importance to what anti-religious lecturers have to say about Science and Religion, or 'to discharge a gun to kill a fly.'

The Development of Religion: a Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology. By Dr. I. KING. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1910.) 7s. 6d. net.

GOD, according to the dictum of a celebrated astronomer, is a hypothesis which the science of astronomy does not need to make. Neither is He included amongst the hypotheses to which the other sciences have resort. Even the science of religion, so long as it is scientific, must abstain from making the hypothesis either that He exists or that He does not exist. All that the science of religion is concerned with is the belief, or the multitudinous forms of the belief, in the reality of the divine. The science of religion takes the belief in deity as a fact: with the value, however, of that fact the science of religion declines to concern itself. If, therefore, or when, we enter on a discussion of religious values, of the value or validity of the belief, we leave the domain of science altogether. Belief in God then, and doing His will, may be felt by one man to be of more value than the whole world beside; while for another man the belief may be of no value, that is to say, for him religious value may be non-existent. And, as already remarked, science formally declines competence to decide which valuation is correct.

To any one who approaches Dr. King's book from this point of view, *The Development of Religion* will appear singularly unsatisfactory. He seems to hold, in some confused way, that the science of religion (or that department of the science of social psychology which deals with religion) can tell us what we ought to believe in the matter of religion, whereas the science only tells us what religious beliefs men do hold or have held. And he assumes, without any attempt at proof, that religious values are of the highest worth; but he also holds that if belief in God be removed, religious values remain intact, or are thereby rather improved in worth. The concept of God, according to Dr. King, is a mere symbol, and it does not symbolize the existence of any supernatural being—it symbolizes 'the reality of life.' That, apparently, is the religious value of the concept of God. Subtract from religion the belief in God and the doing of His will, and what remains is what Dr. King understands by 'religious values.' What does remain, however, we should be puzzled to say.

Religion in the Making. By S. G. SMITH, D.D. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1910.) 5s. net.

THE title of this admirable little book of 240 pages, by the new professor of the department of Sociology and Anthropology in the University of Minnesota, will perhaps be found rather misleading, unless the sub-title—'a study in Biblical Sociology'—is quoted, or borne in mind, to interpret it and to limit the wide sphere of facts and speculations which the title itself suggests. The title by itself might be understood to include religion as it is found amongst savage, if not primitive, peoples. But the book substantially consists of a study of the Bible 'in the light of the principles of sociology.' Dr. Smith for some twenty years has been teaching sociology in the University of Minnesota; during that time he has also been teaching the Bible to special classes in connexion with the People's Church of St. Paul; and now he finds that the two subjects run into each other, and hopes that the sociological examination of the Old Testament may serve as an introduction to the general science of sociology. We believe that his hope is justifiable. But the value of the book—and it is great—lies not so much in its contribution to sociology as in the heart-felt reverence with which he studies, and must have helped his special classes to

study, the Bible. As Professor of Sociology and Anthropology he speaks throughout with authority ; and his style is a continual source of pleasure to the reader.

III.—FOLK-LORE AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

Folk-Lore of the Holy Land. By J. E. HANAUER. (London : Duckworth and Co. Published 1907. Reissued 1910.) 5s. net.

ABOUT one-third of this book was published in America in 1904 under the title of 'Tales told in Palestine,' and the chapters on Animal and Plant-lore were originally contributed to the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*. The book appeals more to the student of folk-lore than to those interested in the Holy Land. Rather less than a quarter of the tales refer to Old Testament figures, and no legends concerning the New Testament are included because 'most, if not all, of them are elsewhere accessible, in the Apocryphal Gospels or one or other of the multiplied Lives of the Saints.' Neither Mr. Hanauer nor Mr. Pickthall, who writes a preface, professes to be a skilled folk-lorist, and parallels consequently are not quoted, which would have been of interest. Thus, a tale which appeared in print in the *Thousand and One Days* the century before last was gathered by Mr. Hanauer from the lips of the people to-day and is given by him under the title of *A Wise Answer*. The fact is interesting as shewing how faithful oral tradition proves to be when we are in a position to test it.

Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion. By J. C. LAWSON, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 12s. net.

MR. LAWSON held the Craven Studentship from 1898 to 1900 and spent that period in Greece investigating the customs and superstitions of modern Greece in their possible bearing upon the life and thought of ancient Greece ; and such leisure as the work of a fellow and lecturer of Pembroke College has allowed him during the ten years that have passed since his return from Greece has been devoted to the preparation of this book, the publication of which has been undertaken by the Syndics of the University Press. In his preface Mr. Lawson speaks of his book as 'a venture new in direction, vague in scope, and possibly void of result.' We are not quite sure in what sense Mr. Lawson

speaks of his venture as new in direction, for he himself acknowledges his indebtedness to *Das Volksleben der Neugriechen und das Hellenische Altertum* by B. Schmidt. Nor are we prepared to go quite so far as to agree with him that his work is vague in scope. Substantially it falls into two parts, one dealing with the survival of pagan deities, the other with the communion of gods and men; and on both Mr. Lawson pronounces himself quite clearly. There is nothing vague in the statement which sums up the first part of his book, *viz.* 'that the religion of Greece both is now, and has ever been, a form, and a little changed form, of polytheism.' That statement is not vague. Neither is it just to the Greek Church. Again, the second part of Mr. Lawson's book on the union and communion of gods with men is summed up by him quite clearly in the words:

'The same rite of marriage was the consummation both of divine life and of human life, men's yearning for close communion with their gods required for its ideal and perfect satisfaction the full union of wedlock; and the sacrament which assured men of this consummation was the highest development of the whole Greek religion, the mysteries.'

That statement again is not vague. Neither is it just to the *mystae* of ancient Greece. Mr. Lawson's work, we venture to say, will not commend itself either to the folk-lorist or to the classical scholar: it shews little judgement, and it is very long.

Greek Saints and Their Festivals. By MARY HAMILTON, M.A., D.Litt. (Carnegie Research Fellow). (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1910.) 5s.

THIS interesting little book is the fruit of three years' travel in Italy and Greece, in the course of which the authoress learned much by personal intercourse about the religious ideas of the peoples of those countries. In writing it she has drawn also freely from Polites, the greatest authority on Greek folk-lore, and made good use of articles in Greek periodicals. Dr. Frazer has naturally been her guide throughout, and she has also learned much from younger British scholars like Mr. Abbott and Mr. R. M. Dawkins. While we are unwilling to criticize her work unfavourably, it must nevertheless be said that the book is neither sufficiently complete to be regarded as a scientific treatise, though it is scholarly throughout, nor really popular enough to be an introduction to the subject for those who know nothing about it.

The best chapter is a very vivid account of a visit which the authoress paid with great discomfort to the festival of the Annunciation at Tenos, and is reprinted from *Blackwood's Magazine*. The account is photographic and not unsympathetic.

A quotation from a Greek newspaper (p. 47) gives a recent instance of modern healing miracles as late as 1909 at Spata in Elis. The writer's conclusion is that 'it seems clear that there exists a non-medical power of healing,' but it is no part of her plan to go further than this.

She does not fall into the mistake of some modern inquirers in seeing survivals everywhere. Indeed, she corrects some mistakes. Thus it appears that Pors was wrong in finding at Rhodes a successor to Dionysos in a 'St. Michael of the wine press,' who is properly 'St. Michael by the harbour.' She finds it quite impossible to trace back the origin of St. John of the Column at Athens to an ancient *heroon*, and rejecting the idea that the Church of the Twelve Apostles at Athens is on the site of the altar to the Twelve Gods, remarks that 'we must reckon with the strong but unrecorded Byzantine influence, when trying to make a connection with pagan times.' But the unbroken Hellenic tradition in the Greek world is a phenomenon unique in history, and there are numerous clear survivals which she mentions. It is very interesting to find that the swallow-song, preserved in Athenaeus, still has parallels in two islands and near Constantinople, but the mention of a schoolmaster in one case leads us to suspect a learned revival of an ancient and harmless practice. Wünsch is perhaps right in linking the Maltese spring-festival in honour of the Baptist with the ancient cult of Adonis, for St. John has no festival in spring, but it is surely fanciful to trace any influence of the Adonia upon Easter ceremonies. On the other hand, the 'burning of Judas' is clearly a pagan custom Christianized. But it should be pointed out that there are some primitive practices which have such vitality that they cannot be killed. Thus bonfires on St. John's Eve were, perhaps are still, common in Cornwall, and when the writer says that her 'last chapter will suggest to the reader, how superstition continues to obstruct the progress of education, trade and general enlightenment,' she hardly can think it possible ever to prevent everybody from having a dislike to certain 'unlucky days.' Moreover, her book is likely to give the impression that there is no distinction in superstition between the Greek peninsula and the Vlachs of Pindus or the semi-savage Albanians. The tendency, on the other hand, of modern education

is to obliterate many of the traces of antiquity in Greece itself, though of course the fervent faith in the intercessory efficacy of the saints, which she does not altogether regard as crass superstition (p. 41), is as strong as ever. She is certainly right in finding strong traces of Roman influence during the period of the early Empire in the spread of the Italian cults of Saturn, Vesta and the Lares to Greece; and her suggestion of Venetian influence (p. 153) in various island ceremonies connected with the sea is very plausible. It is also very likely that the prominence of St. Elias was due to the strength of the Mithras cult, and that his location on hills was due to the story of Carmel; it is less likely that the cult of St. Elias as successor of Helios spread from the one centre of Taygetus.

The book is well got up, and misprints are few. Cozenza (p. 144), 'muliebragenus' (p. 172), and 'invidium' (p. 207) should be corrected. We should also like to suggest to the writer that her last sentence is a little inconsistent with her first paragraphs, and needs a good deal of qualification before it can be accepted as quite fair.

The Book of the Dead. By H. M. TIRARD. (London: S.P.C.K. 1910.) 3s. 6d.

A SHORT popular work on the extraordinary jumble of religious texts which make up the 'Book of the Dead' has long been wanted. Egyptologists have now spent many years trying to elucidate its meaning and assign a place and time of origin to its various component parts, so that, although there still remains much that is baffling and obscure, the study of this 'Guide to the Netherworld' has certainly advanced considerably. Mrs. Tirard's little book can confidently claim for itself the merit of giving a short, and, at the same time, comprehensible account of this peculiar monument of Egyptian magic and superstition, and the authoress is able to make the contents clearer by drawing largely on the commentaries and elucidations of M. Naville and Sir Gaston Maspero. Although clearly in no way purporting to be a scientific treatise on the subject, it gives on the whole a perfectly straightforward and correct account of the ceremonies and rites connected with the cult of the dead which played so important a part in Egypt. Mrs. Tirard, however, confines herself to the papyri of the Eighteenth Dynasty and onwards, and, perhaps wisely, makes little attempt to compare these later rituals with the earlier texts, certainly a difficult task.

Although on the whole her accuracy is commendable, she makes several mistakes which she might have avoided. She seems under the impression that the *Ushabti* figures were in use from the earliest times, when as a matter of fact they did not come into use until the Middle Kingdom, and then rarely. The obelisk on the Thames Embankment did not come from Heliopolis, but from Alexandria, whither it had been brought from Karnak, where it was originally set up by Thothmes III. Like all who are unfamiliar with the Egyptian language, she appears confused by the various forms of transliteration in vogue; she gives us both *Seb* and *Keb*, while *Oirhikanu* is unusual. *Menkara* should be *Menkaura*. On p. 30 Thut is an obvious misprint for Mut. The reference on p. 82 to the Book of Job betrays scant acquaintance with the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. All these, however, are points which can be rectified in a future edition. Mrs. Tirard's little work should be a useful and popular handbook.

The Religion of the Chinese. By J. J. M. DEGROOT. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1910.) 5s. net.

THE series of the Hartford Lamson Lectures on 'the Religions of the World,' of which this volume, by the celebrated Professor of Ethnography in the University of Leiden, forms one, is designed to assist in preparing students for the foreign missionary field. The practical character of the series and of the volume accounts for and justifies the fact that, of the 220 pages which make up the book, some sixty are concerned with Buddhism. Confucianism and Taoism are indeed fully described, and described by the hand of one whose competence and authority are of the highest; while the chapters on the animism and the ancestral worship of the Chinese are such as Dr. DeGroot probably alone of Europeans was competent to write. But it is the chapters on Buddhism which from the missionary point of view constitute the most important part of the book. Dr. DeGroot's view is that it is the Buddhist sects which 'are predestined to be the precursors of Christianity in China.' He is convinced 'that, if Christian missions would make the sects their field of labor, converts would flock to them in considerable numbers.' His pages contain a terrible indictment of the Confucianism which is the State religion. It is not merely that the Chinese State appears never to have discovered that man has religious

and spiritual wants ; the very principle of the Confucian State religion is intolerance, and the action to which it leads is heresy-hunting conducted with a cruelty which the Spanish Inquisition could hardly match. The law of the Ming dynasty originally directed against Buddhism is applicable to Christianity ; and ' that law raises before our eyes, in its fullest reality, the fact that Christianity in the Far East has nothing but martyrdom to expect from the Chinese government, as long as this walks in the path of its own culture.'

Papuan Fairy Tales. By ANNIE KER. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 5s. net.

THESE tales were collected chiefly from natives of the north-east coast of Papua by Mrs. (or Miss ?) Ker, who has known these people for nine years and has spent part of that time alone amongst them in a little mission bungalow. They will be read with equal pleasure by those who like fairy-tales for themselves and by those who are scientifically interested in folk-tales. The English in which they are written is perfectly charming and of a high degree of literary merit. The illustrations, if they are photographs and so far not artistic, are at any rate faithful reproductions of the scenes in which the tales are laid and the sort of people of whom they are told. Most of the tales are new to folk-lorists, but several contain well-known *motifs* and themes. Blue-beard makes his appearance, but he not only kills, he also eats his wives ; and inasmuch as cannibalism is still practised in Papua, it may well be that the cannibalism is not merely a piece of local colouring but an essential feature of the original form of the theme. But, whereas in European versions of such themes cannibalism has the effect of heightening the horror of the tales, in these Papuan versions it appears as part of the ordinary course of human affairs. What is, or rather what to many reviewers will appear, extraordinary is that these very tales that are told by cannibals are full of abundant evidence of the good qualities and better side of human nature ; the traits of character which are amiable and noble in our eyes are esteemed as highly by the Papuans as by ourselves. Probably only a woman could have obtained this evidence, and our thoughts go out in gratitude to the authoress, living alone amongst the natives in a little mission bungalow.

IV.—SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

Christian Progress and other Papers and Addresses. By the Rev. G. CONGREVE. (Longmans. 1910.) 5s.

It has been said that the Anglican Communion can produce much respectability, but no ideals of saintliness. The best answer to that somewhat unkind criticism is the books which from time to time Fr. Congreve sends out from his quiet home at Cowley, or from his equally beloved home in South Africa. In these the saintly ideal is held up to us, the response of the soul to God, the consecrated life, the spiritual life, with no breath of controversy, no jarring note, to trouble the calm surface of the deep well of spiritual life which is ever springing up in the desert of this world of unrest and unbelief and disunion.

As we open the pages of the book before us, we are raised quickly as Dante was borne upward to that point where he could contemplate :

‘L’Amor che muove il sole e l’altre stelle.’

For the love of God is its constant abiding theme. The daily tasks and cares of life are not ignored ; they are transformed ; as the writer says : ‘ Every action done for God, as being His Will, and in the way He wills, is a prayer.’ We are to live in continual prayer, as we have quoted above, but the necessity of special times and seasons is fully set forth. The interior life is to be ever guarded, yet there is to be the ‘ constant returning to God in love all that He has given to me,’ in the daily circumstances.

Father Congreve, more than any spiritual writer we know, brings out the sacramental side of nature.

‘ By contemplation of nature God built up the minds and hearts of His greatest prophets, poets and artists. Nature was God’s home school, in which He reared such men as the writers of Holy Scripture, and, in later times, such as Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, and taught them from childhood to understand and to love. They assimilated God’s lesson, Nature, their sympathy with it is perfect ; it formed their character, gave elevation to their thoughts, and infinite significance to their simplest words. Through nature God often reveals to a soul things too high for words to express.

‘ And so in this way too, nature, which has shared our humiliation and the curse of sin, now contributes to our deliverance and the high purposes of God.’

But quotations do no justice to the book : it must be read and re-read, and the thought which rises in the heart as one turns its pages is the hope that in the English Church not a few may be quickened to seek the ways of quietness of spirit which Fr. Congreve points out. Nothing is more needed at this time than men and women who possess their souls in patience and in peace.

Sermons to Pastors and Masters, By J. H. SKRINE, M.A.
(Longmans. 1910.) 5s. net.

THESE sermons have behind them the mystic's mind which makes the fortunate possessor see all things *sub specie aeternitatis*. We could wish that all teachers would read the Four Addresses to Schoolmasters (Sermons vi-ix). The ideals set before the teaching profession are lofty indeed ; what teacher worth the name desires anything else ? The task set before them is nothing less than this—alike in themselves and in directing the life of thought, passion, action, 'to make smoother and plainer the way for the passage of the Incarnation.' We will quote a few words :

'We are the conveyers of a tradition which is life : our work is more than a doctrine, more even than a discipline ; it is to make our disciples not learn but live ; and only as we live ourselves can we enable life in them.

'Is this to take refuge in the mystical, a region where the soul may find comfort indeed in the face of its eternal fate, but no light or power upon the problems offered in time and space ? Yes, it is mystical ; for what truth is not mystical which is final truth ? But it is not mystical, if the word means that which evades or fears the tests of time and space. We accept the test of practice. We offer our faith in an indwelling God, a very present help in need, to be proved by its mastery in the humblest and most secular practice of our craft—yes, in the cares of the entry book, the kitchen, the account book, the letter bag ; in the week-day humdrum lesson, the mark list, the drill of mind ; the little prizes of the playing-field ; the local sentiments and prides, the ignorant likes and dislikes, the friendships of children and the childish loves.

'And to us it has seemed that even in these places we go not from the Spirit, and the Presence still follows us ; that even there the hand leads, and the right hand holds, and that in these uttermost parts of the divine kingdom the Life is the Light of men.'

The addresses to a Society of Women Students are very striking : Mr. Skrine, like Bishop Brent in *Adventure for God*, takes the Quest of the Holy Grail as his *motif*, and works out the idea under other aspects.

But having said so much in praise, it is needful to indicate some points where we think Mr. Skrine is open to criticism. There is a great deal which is most beautiful and true in the sermon on Sin, which is the first in the book. But Mr. Skrine, if we understand him rightly, seems to think that there is an antithesis between repentance, confession (when he says that 'the confessional system has for idea the surrender of self to the Church or its priest,' he entirely mistakes the whole purpose and grace of such confession) and self-surrender of the whole life. Why, the very purpose of repentance is surrender to God. 'Dead unto sin, alive unto God.' But death to sin must precede life unto God. And what is the use of telling the lost, the people whom the world counts sinners above the rest, that they must surrender themselves to God, unless you can tell them how that surrender can be made, how they can be given something worth surrendering, *i.e.* a soul cleansed and set free? The truth is that sin is an offence of the will against God, a Personal God, and unless there is penitence, a response to offended Love, how can that surrender of life be made?

Of course life unto God means, as Mr. Skrine says, union, harmony, peace, as St. John and St. Paul have taught us, but it is penitence which makes the forgiven and redeemed of the Lord answer back to Him. And when Mr. Skrine tells us 'We have replaced the old inhibitions and incitements of a carnally imagined woe and a mundane bliss by the instinct that wills to live, the instinct that dreads to die,' we ask, is that all? Is there not also the desire to see God, the longing for that Vision of Him which is promised to the pure in heart, the fulfilment of that of which Dante says:

'A quella Luce cotal si diventa
Che volgersi da lei per altro aspetta
E impossibil che mai si contenta.'

The answer to the question in 'The man who thinks and the man who sings may also be a miserable sinner or may be saved from his sins, but the thinker and the singer in this man—what of him?' may be left to God; after all the old words rise to our lips, 'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?' We cannot get rid of the fact that character, moral purpose, does affect in the long-run the whole personality. Aberrations, moral lapses there may be, as there are in many great souls, but these do not affect the trend, the bent which was not selfish, not cruel, not dishonest.

But we cannot omit a reference to the addresses to Ordination Candidates. They are very beautiful, very thoughtful, and although some of us might have desired more reference to the special work of a priest, more direct teaching on the inner life, more indications as to the Ministry of Conversion, Mr. Skrine might reply that half is sometimes better than the whole. But we could wish, that in speaking of Christian apologetic and the lines on which the priest should work, he had not written: 'First then, our apologetic will be aimed to prove that the Faith makes for practical success in society, politics, and the market.'

Does it? We greatly doubt it. Those who *know* tell us there never was a time when it was harder for a man engaged in the world of business, of affairs, to be a Christian. And society and politics, are either of these an easy sphere for the practice of the Christian Life? Rather, it is heroic ideals which are needed. This, however, is only an incidental remark in the course of an address, and is qualified by much that follows. Nevertheless it is true that perhaps the Church would be more attractive to the young and ardent of both sexes, if it were made clearer that to be a Christian means a great surrender, a great adventure.

Christ and Christ's Religion : Sermons. By F. H. DUDDEN, D.D.
'The Scholar as Preacher,' Second Series. (T. and T. Clark.
1910.) 4s. 6d. net.

THESE sermons, as the title discloses, are concerned chiefly with certain aspects of our Lord's teaching. Out of the treasures of the Gospel Dr. Dudden has collected fresh and original lessons. The words he quotes at the end of the first sermon might serve as a motto to his book:

'The world is weary of new tracts of thought
That lead to naught,
Sick of quack remedies prescribed in vain
For mortal pain;
Yet still above them all one Figure stands
With outstretched Hands.'

Where all is so good it is invidious to select, but we are tempted to quote from the sermon on the Spiritual Christ; it is peculiarly valuable.

Dr. Dudden teaches what we forget so often, that 'the very pith and point of our religion lies in this—that our Master is

not gone. . . . Jesus Christ is not departed from our midst, but is actually with men to-day.' He dwells with great insistence on the Indwelling of our Lord in the souls of His followers: 'It is no antiquarian figure, no dead founder of a religion, but a Christ really living within us, a Christ really personal to each of us, a Christ Whom we really know inwardly and experimentally.'

And then with equal insistence the preacher points out the need of the study of the Gospels:

'It is simply impossible that we can ever get to know what the Christ of our consciousness is, unless we have got to know what the Jesus of Galilee was. . . . Yes, brethren, to interpret aright Christ's manifestation to ourselves, we must go back again and again to the study of the Gospels. It is there we meet the authentic Christ by Whom our experience is tested. It is there that we read His Character. It is there that His Spirit is laid open and revealed. It is there that we find the material whereby we may now discern His Presence and His Power. "Back to the Gospels" must be the watchword of all ages. For these are the fountain of the Heavenly Knowledge, the deep, clear wells, in which are reflected the faithful image of the Saviour.'

Dr. Dudden is very far removed from the kind of Modernism which would regard the historic basis of our Lord's life as of no importance.

He has some excellent words on the surrendered life as following on the possession of our Lord, and shews how very much more this means than a mere external imitation of His example.

'I cannot indeed but admire those devoted disciples, from St. Francis down to Tolstoi, who have striven with magnificent heroism to imitate the Master. I am not without sympathy with certain teachers of our day, who claim that all Christian conduct should be regulated by the standard, what would Jesus do? *Vitam Jesu stude imitari* is an inspiring challenge.

'Yet I am none the less convinced that a literal reproduction of Christ's outward life and action is not what He desired. Can it really be held, for example, that we should have no fixed home, because the poor wandering Teacher had not where to lay His Head? or that we should abstain from politics because He abstained from politics? or that we should be indifferent to art and secular literature because for Him these things had no apparent interest? Surely not. Christ seeks in us for originals, not for mechanical imitations. He asks us to repeat, not the manner of His Life, but the principle of it, not the details, but the type, not the form of it, but its essence.

'He never demands that we should copy His past; but He ever requires that we should "christen" our present, by appropriating and exhibiting in the twentieth century the Spirit—the self-same Spirit that He possessed and manifested with such perfection in the first.'

Man's Need of God. By the Rev. D. SMITH, Professor of Theology in Magee College, Londonderry. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1910.) 6s.

THESE sermons, which were preached to the congregation of a small country town in Perthshire, are redolent of robust and cheerful Christianity. No gloom of Calvinism hangs over them, and indeed in Professor Smith's hands Calvinism is made to appear positively cheerful.

In a sermon on the 'Perseverance of Believers' Professor Smith makes Calvinism quite the better part. He observes, we may say *en passant*, that Anglican theology is Arminian. Anglican theology on the doctrine of grace is Catholic: we are taught to pray in our earliest years that we may continue in a state of salvation to which we thank God that He has brought us by Baptism. But it is quite true that 'something like a miracle of evil is needed, if a soul which once truly embraced Divine promises is to be torn away from them at last,' as Dr. Mason says, but as he justly remarks, the doctrine of final perseverance becomes false and pernicious once it becomes a dogma.

Professor Smith is obliged to mention backsliding, which is really the same thing as falling from grace. His quotation of Cromwell's words on his deathbed makes one realize the tremendous difference between Puritanism and the penitence and humility of the Saints.

Professor Smith has a sentence in this sermon which makes one shudder; he speaks of reaching Heaven just saved. 'For my part, I would rather perish.' This is one of those rhetorical sayings which sound very fine and mean nothing.

Again, in his sermon on our Lord's words about Eternal Tabernacles, Professor Smith is very insistent on the idea that these words combine two ideas—on the one hand, stability, endurance, and on the other hand, unsettlement, uncertainty—and that Christ means us to understand that there will be 'a life of unwearied activity.'

He does not at all approve of Faber's words:

'Father of Jesus, love's Reward,
What rapture will it be
Prostrate before Thy throne to lie
And gaze and gaze on Thee.'

'Ah! no!' says Professor Smith, 'that will never be our *employment*. That were Nirvana (?), not Heaven. That is in truth an impossible ideal which Faber expresses. It, too,

is a contradiction in terms, for the rest which it speaks of is the rest of idleness, and in idleness there is no rest but intolerable weariness.' All this seems to us the shallow talk which appeals to the half educated and wholly prosaic mind. Faber's ideal not improbably appeals to many who are very weary of the ceaseless activities of the Church on earth, and after all one of the highest beatitudes is 'they shall see God,' not—they shall be unceasingly active. The Beatific Vision is not purely an ideal of idleness, at least not as it has been set forth by the Saints.

Of course all this is mere disputation about symbols of that life of which we know very little; why should Professor Smith attack aspirations and hopes which are quite as Christian as his own?—only he does not understand them. Having criticized thus, we must add that there are many excellent discourses, full of good and true words, and not very profound teaching, just the setting forth of the aspects of the Gospel which would appeal to the Scottish mind.

There is, of course, no sacramental teaching except a Communion sermon, with which we naturally do not agree, and no sense of the Church of the corporate fellowship. How few Presbyterians seem to rise to the noble and Catholic conceptions of the late Dr. Milligan. It is this lack which so impoverishes a book like the one before us.

V.—LITURGICA AND MUSIC.

The Church Year and Kalendar. 'Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks.' By (the late) JOHN DOWDEN, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 4s. net.

THIS work contains a very handy and useful account of the rise and growth of the Dominical Year, with its feasts and fasts, and also of the ecclesiastical festivals and fasts which are assigned to fixed days in the Kalendar. It commences with a bibliography, containing very convenient notes (by the editors of the series) on the scope of the different works mentioned. To this succeed chapters on the Week, the days of the Martyrs, festivals of our Lord, festivals of the Blessed Virgin Mary, festivals of the Apostles and New Testament Saints, Seasons of Preparation and Penitence, the observance of Easter and the Paschal Cycle, Western and Eastern Kalendars. We think that this little book will prove to be very useful, and if we touch rather upon apparent

deficiencies, it is not because we are not alive to its many excellences. No doubt the lamented author would have introduced several improvements if he had been spared to see the work through the press.

The distinction between the Lenten and the Paschal fasts is not made apparent. The earliest method of keeping the Christian Passover was probably by the observance of one day (or rather one night) as a commemoration of both the death and resurrection of our Lord ; and this would originally coincide with the Jewish Passover, and so fall on any day of the week. When the feast was reserved for a Sunday, the keeping of Good Friday and the Paschal fast (of forty hours) would naturally follow speedily. This Paschal fast was eventually extended (at least in certain localities) to include the whole of Holy Week. But, as was pointed out by Mgr. Duchesne,¹ the Lenten fast was another thing altogether. It took its origin almost certainly in the public preparation of candidates for Baptism, and, although the earliest notices of it are of the fourth century, the fact that no festivals were allowed to be celebrated during its continuance would seem to point to an earlier origin ; for it would be difficult to alter the observance of festivals that fell at that time of the year, and had already obtained popularity. In the West the Lenten and Paschal fasts ran concurrently, but in the East the Lenten fast was considered to be at an end before the Paschal fast (of the Holy Week) was entered upon—the forty days in each case including Saturdays and Sundays, although the latter day was not fasted, nor (in the East) the former.

In the Mozarabic rite the immediate preparation for Baptism lasted for three continuous weeks, and it is possible that this may have been originally the case at Rome also.²

The Nestorian Lent of seven weeks might have been mentioned with its curious custom of special services during three weeks—the first, middle, and last. It is possible that the Armenian fast before Christmas (p. 78) may be of kin to this intermittent observance.

The Rogation days are noted as a Gallican and non-Roman

¹ Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 233.

² The Gospels for the last half of Lent are all taken from St. John's Gospel ; those for the first half from all four Evangelists indiscriminately. This seems to indicate the presence of two different strata in the series of services.

institution; but no mention is made of the fact that similar Rogations existed in the Mozarabic rite in September, November, and January (before Epiphany), and were even ordered to be kept every month by Canon 23 of the Council of Elvira.¹ A Rogation-tide in December lasted till the eleventh century.² These Rogations of Ascension-tide, the seventh, ninth, and eleventh months, bear a suggestive parallelism to the Roman Embertides of the first, seventh, and tenth months, and after Pentecost. The Mozarabic Rogations are kept *after* Ascension, as also the Ambrosian, so as not to infringe on the festival character of the great forty days.

The observance of the week of Pentecost apparently originated from Rome. It was not observed in the Mozarabic rite, nor originally (apparently) in the Ambrosian. Indeed, it seems to have been a natural consequence of the purely Roman custom of making Pentecost a season for public Baptism supplementary to Easter; and even at Rome Pentecost seems never to have had the importance as a baptismal season that Easter had, and consequently the services of the week had less importance than those of Easter week.

An ingenious theory as to the origin of Trinity Sunday is given, but no notice is taken of the fact that the Sunday following the Ember days was always inscribed '*Dominica Vacat*,' the mass of the vigil being really the mass of the Sunday, and hence there being no mass to follow at the usual hour. When it became necessary to supply a mass on this Sunday at the usual hour, a votive mass of the Trinity was made use of—possibly for the reason suggested—and this proper mass drew after it the proper office.

With regard to the other great 'focus' (as we may term it) of the Christian Year—Christmas or Epiphany—two points might have been made plainer: (1) at Rome Christmas was the original festival without Epiphany; but over almost all the rest of Christendom Epiphany was the original festival without any observance of Christmas; and (2) the real original meaning of the Epiphany was the manifestation of the Son of God to the world, or rather the manifestation of the Three Persons of the Godhead which took place at His Baptism. As the birth of our Lord was brought into greater prominence by the current controversies, this also was drawn in under the same general

¹ Cf. The Rule of St. Fructuosus, c. 10.

² *Liber Ordinum*, p. 490.

idea. Afterwards the greater part of the East adopted the Roman festival of the Nativity, and the Romans added a new festival on the date of the Epiphany, and even called it by a similar title; but their festival was really an entirely new festival, *viz.* the festival of the visit of the Magi to the infant Saviour. The festival of Epiphany naturally became a second season for Baptism (of course not at Rome); and the possibility must be taken account of that the season of Advent may have originated as a season of preparation for Baptism at Epiphany, or (later) at Christmas. The fourth Canon of the First Council of Saragossa, A.D. 381, seems to point to a three-weeks' preparation before Epiphany similar to the Mozarabic three-weeks' preparation for Baptism before Easter; and when this season of Baptism was shifted to Christmas (Canon iv, *Concil. Gerundense*, A.D. 517) this would seem to necessitate a three-weeks' preparation before Christmas. At any rate, the Advent season seems to have begun in Spain, and to have had there a fuller development than in the Roman rite.

The Vigils were originally (as is well known) the *nights* before the great festivals; and there is great obscurity about the transition of this observance to the later kind of vigil, which (in mediaeval times) meant the observance of the *day* before certain festivals, for the services of which days proper antiphons and masses, etc., were appointed. A curious instance of night vigils obtained at Milan, where vigils were kept on the nights of the Fridays in Lent. The vigil service began at the hour of Vespers and consisted mainly of lessons, finishing with the mass on Saturday morning. These lessons are still alluded to in the rubrics of the Breviary as appointed for Vespers on these Fridays, and the masses are those still said on the Saturdays in Lent: and this is the reason why no masses are said on Fridays in Lent in the Ambrosian rite.

The history of days in honour of the Blessed Virgin is somewhat surprising to those who have not studied the point. Until considerably after the age of St. Gregory there was at Rome no festival of the Virgin (neither Annunciation nor Purification, nor Nativity, nor Repose) except the commemoration on January 1, which Mgr. Duchesne calls '*une sorte de renouvellement de la solennité de Noël avec une préoccupation spéciale de la Vierge-mère*'—not altogether unlike the way in which the mass of Sexagesima Sunday is treated as a commemoration of St. Paul. Outside of Rome, the earliest festival of the Virgin in the West was the Annunciation, which apparently originated

in Spain in the seventh century, and was kept (with some variation) on December 18. Nearly at the end of the same century the four festivals enumerated above were imported at Rome direct from the East, without any reference to Spain. The Advent antiphons ('*O Sapientia*,' etc.) seem to have arisen in connexion with the Spanish festival of the Annunciation on December 18, beginning on the first Evensong of the festival (December 17), though they were afterwards extended backwards to December 16, and even earlier.

It would have been very interesting if the author had included the list of festivals from the oldest Mozarabic service-book—the *Orationale Gothicum*, which is a MS. of the seventh or eighth century, and enshrines a set of services of a markedly more ancient type than those in the Mozarabic Missal and Breviary. An account of the Coptic Ecclesiastical Year was probably not readily available; and for the Nestorian Ecclesiastical Year and Kalendar Dr. Maclean's East-Syrian Daily Offices may be consulted.

We wish this useful series every success, in the hope that it may stimulate among the rising generation of scholars an interest in liturgical origins.

Hymns Ancient and Modern, for Use in the Services of the Church, with Accompanying Tunes. Historical Edition with Notes on the Origin of both Hymns and Tunes and a General Historical Introduction; illustrated by Facsimiles and Portraits. Printed for the Proprietors. (London: Clowes. 1909.) 12s. 6d. net.

THE Proprietors of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* have gained the sincere thanks of all lovers of hymns by the publication of this beautiful book. So much may be said both by those who have felt dissatisfied, and perhaps a little irritated, by the changes which were introduced into the new edition in 1904 as well as by those who regarded them with favour. The present volume, of which the only drawback is its *format*, is far more than a large and well-printed edition of the hymnal; for it contains a short history of each hymn, the original in the case of those which are translations, and the history of each tune so far as it is known. To the whole are prefixed 111 pages of historical introduction dealing with the development of hymnology and enriched by a large number of portraits and reproductions from MSS. and the title-pages of rare hymn-books and psalters. The end of the

book is taken up with biographies of authors and composers, a chronological list of tunes, and numerous indexes which add greatly to its value, concluding with a serviceable general Index and Table of Contents.

Dr. Frere's 'Historical Introduction' traces first the history of hymnody in the early Church through the East and West, the early monastic cycle and the Anglo-Irish one which displaced it, the mediaeval and later Latin series of hymns, the Sequences and Plainsong Hymn Melodies, the sections naturally becoming more detailed as they succeed one another. Then follows the treatment of the Old Versions of the Metrical Psalms when in the sixteenth century hymnody was stimulated once more by a controversial interest as it had been in the fourth. These sections are illustrated by the very curious title-page of the first Geneva edition (1556) of the 'One and Fiftie Psalmes of David in Englishe metre, whereof. 37. were made by Thomas Sterneholde: and the rest by others,' of the unique copy at St. Paul's of the edition of 1561, and of many others, including Archbishop Parker's privately printed Psalter of 1567, of which only eight copies are said to exist, three being in the British Museum and one at Lambeth. This Psalter is specially notable for its 'Arguments' and collects, for the curious acrostic preface to Ps. cxix. which discloses the authorship, and as containing the 'canon' and 'ordinal' by Tallis (1520-85), who bridges the transition from pre-Reformation to post-Reformation Church music in England. Then we turn to the German Chorale to come back to the English Psalter in the New Version, the rising influence of Congregationalism and Methodism, the gradual decay of Psalmody and the 'Triumph of Hymns.' It is difficult, and it would certainly be distasteful, to criticize small points in so large a collection of facts and examples, illuminated with so much learning and insight; and it is safe to say that no one who reads the Introduction will fail to turn to it again and again afterwards.

Not the least interesting part of the book to many readers will be the account of how the collection of 'Hymns Ancient and Modern' has been developed from the small trial volume of 138 hymns issued by Novello in 1859 to the present volume which contains 643; and it will be unknown perhaps to some that the book is not, and never has been, private property in which any Trustee has an hereditary interest. The gaps caused by death in the body of the Proprietors are filled by election, and it is their duty 'to control, to revise when necessary, and to hand on to the Church of the future.'

Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Edited by J. A. FULLER MAITLAND. Vol. V. T—Z and Appendix. (Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 21s.

WITH the fifth volume of *Grove's Dictionary* Mr. Fuller Maitland brings his editorial labours to a close. Its appearance has been considerably delayed, but the large appendix shews that this delay has been due only to the desire to bring the work thoroughly up to date. Of new articles on a large scale there are but few in this volume—perhaps that on 'Tablature,' by Miss Janet Dodge, is the most important. Miss Dodge has long been regarded as the chief authority on lute-music and kindred subjects, and she has succeeded here in presenting her vast knowledge in a very lucid and interesting manner. Mrs. Newmarch contributes a well-written study of Tchaikovsky, and Mr. Heron-Allen, a learned notice of the Tieffenbrucker family, one of whom was better known under the name of Duiffoprout and generally supposed to have been the first violin-maker. The article on the violin family has been revised and enlarged by the same author, in collaboration with the editor, and is a valuable contribution to the history of musical instruments: it is further provided with a bibliography filling a whole column of small type.

The articles in the Appendix, in so far as they are new articles and not merely collections or additions to those in the body of the work, are, as might be expected, devoted mainly to the rising generation of musicians. With regard to some of them it might have been advisable to omit the critical remarks that have been appended to their biographies; not that we wish to take exception to the actual terms either of praise or blame—indeed, the editor and his collaborators have shewn considerable tact in their judgements—but in ten or twenty years' time the reader may very probably feel that in many cases the judgement is no longer applicable. An article on 'English Folk-Music' by the editor appears here, and it is curious that it should not have been inserted in its proper alphabetical place. In spite of the author's well-known enthusiasm and learning the article seems rather too modest by the side of those on Scottish, Welsh, and Irish music; perhaps it was thought that the number of popular English songs referred to under their separate titles made further elaboration unnecessary. In this case it would have been useful to the student to have added an alphabetical list of the minor articles in question.

The completion of the Dictionary offers a suitable opportunity for reviewing the new edition as a whole. It is always easy to pick holes in a work of this kind. Absolute accuracy is impossible of attainment, and it might perhaps be doubted whether it is even of pressing necessity. No serious researcher would ever accept the statement of any dictionary on a single point of importance without verifying the source from which the statement was taken. The more modern contributors generally cite their authorities with care, and so in most cases did Grove himself; with regard to the less scholarly contributors to the first edition, the student may be fairly sure of finding all their doubtful statements in Fétis or Burney. The general level of scholarship was high in the first edition, and Mr. Fuller Maitland has certainly maintained the second at a still higher level. A work of this kind is not to be judged, as many reviewers have judged it, on the articles devoted to the great names of the present day: the real value of it lies far more in the immense number of short notices on comparatively obscure subjects, not, as was too often the case in the first edition, mere translations from Fétis, but the outcome of serious research. In this way the Dictionary has been largely a labour of love; the erudition of contributors such as Mr. G. E. P. Arkwright, Mr. F. Kidson, the Rev. W. H. Frere, Miss Stainer, Mr. Barclay Squire, Mr. R. A. Streatfeild, Mr. D. J. Blaikley, Mr. Heron-Allen, to name but a few of them, is the result of a lifetime of patient and self-sacrificing study, and is not to be valued at so many guineas per thousand words. The same devotion is to be observed in the work of the editor himself; and we can think of no other person living who could have been even equally suitable for so responsible a post. We may occasionally feel that he is not always absolutely impartial with regard to modern composers, and still more must we regret his somewhat exaggerated 'piety' with respect to the writers of a past generation. We could have wished that Sir Hubert Parry had revised all his articles so as to bring them into touch with the music of the present day; in the case of many articles by the late Mr. Rockstro, and sometimes in the case of minor articles which Sir George Grove apparently wrote himself for want of anyone else to write them, it would surely have been better to rewrite them completely rather than to add a parenthetical sentence here and there, or a footnote to say that 'this of course refers to the year 1882.' We do not want a second edition of *Grove's Dictionary*, if it is to be merely a document to illustrate the state

of musical knowledge in England thirty years ago. Still, it must be fully realized that Mr. Fuller Maitland's task has been an exceptionally arduous one, and one that called not merely for learning but for literary experience and a carefully balanced judgement. Bearing this in mind, we may certainly say that the new edition has achieved the difficult result of being even superior, as a work of learning and of literature, to the first, and we can imagine no better tribute to the memory of its illustrious founder.

VI.—SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

The Gospel in a Great City. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop WELLDON, Dean of Manchester. (Smith, Elder and Co. 1910.) 6s. net.

The Morality of Social Pleasures. By the Rev. MONTAGUE FOWLER. (Longmans. 1910.) 3s. 6d. net.

Social Duties from the Christian Point of View. By CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON. (University of Chicago Press, and Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 5s. net.

Christianity and Social Questions. By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Ely. (Duckworth and Co. 1910.) 2s. 6d. net.

Town Study. By M. M. PENSTONE. (National Society's Repository. 1910.) 4s. net.

Young Gaoil Birds. By CHARLES E. B. RUSSELL, M.A. (Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 3s. 6d. net.

It is to be feared that there are still some Guardians of the Poor, members of Education Committees, and others acting in public spheres of equal importance and complexity to whom sociology represents a superfluous pedantry, but if supply is any measure of demand there must be a considerable section of the public interested in, at least, the rudiments of the subject. The six books named above, widely as they differ, all deal more or less directly with social problems.

Thanks to statistics, official and unofficial, we have now either frankly to recognize or deliberately to ignore a mass of information pointing to the existence of certain aggregate social and economic conditions which do not admit of being dealt with by mere efforts at individual reformation; conditions in which degradation, physical, intellectual and spiritual, is,

with some almost miraculous exceptions, a practical necessity. Patience with such conditions, and hope against hope in the efficacy of intensive methods of soul-culture, are to some minds saving virtues, to others sins against humanity. And some there are who seem to hold both views, together or in turns.

The Dean of Manchester proclaims himself a believer in undenominational religious teaching. It is an attitude to which the best headmasters are, from the nature of the case, inclined. It is their business to be inclusive, and the Dean is able to look back and bless even the solution arrived at in 'the public schools, where the possibility of religious teaching, with all its happy and sacred associations, rests upon the willingness of parents to accept such religious teaching as is strictly Christian, yet as far as possible from sectarian bias.' Perhaps there is a tendency in these sermons to extend the principle of 'the common residuum' to the irreconcilable creeds of Socialism and Individualism. Thus

'The poverty and the misery of the world are solemn facts. . . . Yet who doubts that the greater part of the sufferings and privations which fall upon the poor are the inevitable results of their own conduct? If it were only possible that they should obey the simple and severe laws of thrift and temperance and purity, there would be no need for a Socialistic regeneration of English life.'

Yet, so obvious is it that to make, if it were possible, the wretched into saints in order to relieve the comfortable from the sting of conscience, is not the perfect way of social salvation, that we read in another sermon, 'The Church must refuse to acquiesce in the wholly irreligious assumption that a city cannot be made a holy place. . . . She must insist upon the duty of providing, soon or late, such social conditions as will afford every man, woman or child who is born into the world a reasonable chance of living a decent, honest and God-fearing life.' Again, in a sermon on the text 'They all with one accord began to make excuse,' we are told that 'business is essentially self-seeking.' But the moral possibilities of commerce seem to be more favourably regarded when the Dean, in the same sermon, pleads with the man who is making a fortune, 'I would *respectfully charge him in Christ's name* to take heed that his generosity, nay his spirituality, shall not decline as his worldly wealth increases.' 'I cannot forget,' writes the Dean elsewhere, 'that the earliest Christians were socialists.' That is certainly a grave, and possibly a needless admission. Sir William Ramsay, at least, has quite lately told us that in the primitive community of goods

'no rule of selling is stated . . . a habit arising from love and brotherly kindness is implied, not a regulation enforced on the members. Where property has all ceased to exist because all has been divided up, there can be no charity. Now the giving of charity according to one's property was one of the most marked features of the early Church.'

From a sound discourse on 'The Church and the Stage' (in which, by the by, 'giveth *good* to all flesh' seems to be a misprint) we pass, naturally, to Mr. Fowler's *Morality of Social Pleasures*. It is perhaps to be regretted that this book, pervaded as it is by an atmosphere of good sense, is more calculated to appeal to the conscientious than to the frivolous. It is, in fact, a dull book on an attractive subject. It will probably find its public and will certainly do them no harm. But, while there are questions which can usefully be discussed without inspiration, it may be doubted whether the relation of the joy of life to its severity is one of them. Heine on the subject is less safe but more readable. The chapter on gambling, with telling quotations from Bishop Westcott and Herbert Spencer, and that on 'Week End Entertaining,' are among the best in the book. We cannot refrain from quoting the reply of the Highland mother to an Englishman's inquiry whether her Johnny wasn't ill: 'Oh no, sir, he's all right, but our Johnny, he's that pious and morose on the Lord's day, it's just a pleasure to his father and myself.' Yet, as Mr. Henderson puts it in his *Social Duties from the Christian Point of View*, 'a civilized, not to say a Christian community of workers will insist on weekly periods of rest for all classes of workers,' a statement typical of a book which is rather courageously dry than culpably dull. The chapter from which this quotation comes is, in fact, one of the best in a very useful American manual based on the fact that 'many teachers of young men and women have discovered that religious and moral instruction must be made concrete and practical at the approach of majority.' Chapter XIV deals concisely and temperately with Socialism, and quotes from a Harvard professor the suggestive paradox that 'whoever prizes human conditions in proportion to their tendency to develop powers must commiserate the children of the rich and think of them as our unfortunate classes.' The fundamental defect of the author's system seems to be that everyone's time is to be spent in learning everyone else's business, and the lives of 'policemen, justices of the peace, township trustees, school superintendents or inspectors, councilmen, jailers, superintendents of poorhouses and others'

are to be made a burden to them by the persistent inquiries and criticisms of 'members of the class' in search of an object lesson.

Archdeacon Cunningham's *Christianity and Social Questions* is a manual of somewhat similar scope by one who, though formerly a lecturer in Harvard University, approaches the subject from the English point of view. The task, in both cases, is one of immense difficulty, and it is no great wonder if the Archdeacon has not always succeeded in being either quite simple or quite profound. He writes, not for a class of students, but for the man in the street, or, perhaps, the man in the better sort of street, but in a form which will hardly attract such readers and in terms which they will occasionally fail to understand. The author has, indeed, not greatly troubled himself about style. Instances of impossible constructions are numerous. Examples taken at hazard include 'one villein might have become a rich man and another rendered poor'—'The time has long gone by since. . . .' We are told of an 'incentive' that 'leads' and a treatment that results in a false diagnosis. But the frequent occurrence of such sentences as 'These considerations seem to show that the credit system need not be regarded as an untameable monster but as . . .' etc., etc., seems almost to indicate a morbid preference. As to small holdings, Dr. Cunningham seems to be more optimistic at p. 113 than at p. 173. He would possibly have modified the latter if he had seen Lord Lucas' recent circular on Agricultural Organization in Hants, Dorset and Wilts.

Miss Penstone's *Town Study* is primarily a teacher's storehouse of elementary facts bearing on 'civics.' Like the two books last mentioned, it includes a valuable bibliography. Considering the immense amount of ground covered, a high standard of accuracy is maintained. It seems almost captious to object that a dogcart is not a survival of the cart drawn by dogs but a conveyance to carry sporting dogs, or that 'high Court of Justice, Court of Chancery, Court of King's Bench, and Court of Appeal' is a somewhat confusing list of 'different kinds of High Courts,' or, again, that the account of the origin of telegraphy seems to countenance the discarded view that the 'power of attracting bodies to itself' belongs properly to amber or other substances rather than to the mysterious electrons. What is more noteworthy is Miss Penstone's occasional want of clearness and accuracy in dealing with educational matters. At page 352, for instance, it would be more correct to say, in accordance

with the much-quoted judgement of Lord Eldon, that an endowed school is held to be a school for classical teaching if it is by foundation a grammar school than vice versa. In the references to the Education Act, 1902, the important distinction between the *power* to provide secondary and the *obligation* to provide elementary schools is lost sight of, and the statement that county and municipal boroughs manage their own elementary and higher education should be qualified by the proviso of section 1 that 'The Council of a borough *with a population over 10,000* shall be the local authority for Elementary Education.' At page 356, besides omitting to notice that 'Bedale's school at Petersfield' is chiefly important as a pioneer venture in the co-education of the sexes, the author falls into the too common error of supposing that all education of children of elementary school age is elementary education. Later, however (*viz.* at page 363), she hints at the true distinction in the observation that 'a general elementary education is to be thought of as leading nowhere beyond itself.' This, indeed, is where the 'scholarship' problem comes in.

Mr. C. E. B. Russell's *Young Gaol Birds* is a book of quite another type. As in his earlier works, in collaboration with Mr. Rigby, he goes to living humanity for his lessons. His gaol-birds are 'human documents,' and even such a long-winded sentence as that which overflows from page 84 to page 85 is powerless to damp the reader's interest. Here, indeed, we see the effects of environment exemplified—and sometimes wonderfully resisted—in the living, personal slum-dwellers, and beneath the practical lessons of a manifold experience we catch the pathos of alternating lapse and aspiration in the lads and undaunted faithfulness in their friend.

The object lessons are, moreover, gathered and enforced in a useful 'Postscript' on such matters as 'The Probation of Offenders Act,' 'The Prevention of Crimes Act' and what Mr. Russell inadvertently calls 'The Children's Bill.'

VII.—HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

The Two Empires: the Church and the World. By the late B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., Bishop of Durham. (Macmillan. 1909.) 6s.

BISHOP WESTCOTT'S representatives have found among his papers some old lectures on Church history, delivered soon after

1870, when he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. It seems that at that time it was no one's duty to lecture on the topic, and Dr. Westcott undertook what some junior teacher might well have done, the delivery of a course of elementary lectures to undergraduates on the history down to the Nicene Council. They are excellent and conscientious work, giving in outline what was known some forty years ago, and interesting as shewing what were the points that a really great teacher chose for emphasis. They are also interesting as shewing how much has been learnt in the last generation. Opening the book at random in the middle, we find an account of the Decian Persecution without any mention of the *libelli* found in Egypt, the discovery of which has done so much to make the story intelligible; and it is quite clear that the account of the Arian controversy was written before Dr. Gwatkin's important contribution to our knowledge. The volume, then, is one of obsolete and elementary lectures, which we cannot believe that the Bishop would have thought of publishing, though it is redeemed, here and there, by some of his happy and luminous phrases. The title was chosen by the editor, one of the Bishop's sons. It reminds us of the names given by the author to many weighty essays by which he has charmed and instructed us. But the reader who is beguiled by this title will be as much disappointed as the student who expects to find a compendium of historical facts. Truer respect would have been shewn to Bishop Westcott had the book remained unprinted.

Saint Theresa: the History of her Foundations. Translated from the Spanish by Sister AGNES MASON; with a Preface by Sir E. M. SATOW, G.C.M.G. (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 4s. 6d. net.

SAINT TERESA has suffered more, perhaps, than any other writer in comparatively modern times from not being allowed to speak for herself. Both her matter and her manner have been so far beyond the experience and the capacity of most of her admirers belonging to the same confession that, as Sister Agnes Mason points out in her preface, the Saint's writings have been, from very early times, extensively 'edited' for the benefit of the faithful. This is clearly brought out by a comparison of the facsimile reprint of the original (issued in 1880) with previous Spanish editions. It is from the 1880 reprint that this translation has been made, and it is, so far,

the only one that in the least represents the vividness, raciness, and exquisite homeliness of the Spanish. Those persons whose knowledge of St. Teresa's writings have been confined to the always dingy, and often unmeaning, renderings of Mr. Dalton, bald and vacuous as they are, will hardly recognize the style as being that of the woman they supposed they knew. But this is the real Teresa.

Don Benedict Zimmerman has rightly pointed out that in English, where *Th* has a special sound of its own, the name should be written Teresa. *Theresa* may plead a superiority in appearance, and the sanction of some usage; but it is incorrect usage. We hope that this volume may have so wide an acceptance as will stimulate Sister Agnes Mason to extend her labours to *The Way of Perfection* and *The Interior Castle*.

A Manual of English Church History. By the Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A., formerly Fellow and Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London. (Longmans. 1910.) 3s. 6d. net.

MR. HOLE, the memory of whose erudition still hangs about King's College, was engaged for many years in the study of Church history. When Bishop Stubbs gave up his work on the English characters for the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* Mr. Hole succeeded him. The contrast between the trained historian and the man of uncritical reading was striking; and in the earlier part of the present volume we observe the same weakness. It is astonishing to find Inett and Soames and Sharon Turner, Bishop Short and Mr. Boulton quoted as authorities. But in fact Mr. Hole's heart was not in this part of his work. He begins to shew interest when he comes to Wyclif, but is at his best in the Reformation. His view is not altogether our own, but he is always well informed, and has the tact to select from a great store of facts many which are unhackneyed, yet are as instructive as the more familiar episodes. This merit is displayed throughout the later history. Though we cannot recommend this as a solitary guide, yet we could advise any reader to turn to it in search of additional and well-chosen illustrations of our Church history. However well-informed he may be he is likely to find something new. Especially for that period which is so little known, the one which immediately precedes the Oxford Movement, he will find this book of service. Forgotten worthies like Bishop Kaye of Lincoln and Mr. T. T.

Biddulph of Bristol are brought to light, and the legislation of the period is duly recorded. The most recent period is rather perfunctorily treated by some unnamed editors, who give little more than the annals of the time. But the substance of the book was well worth writing, and reading.

Boniface of Crediton and his Companions. By the Right Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D., Bishop of Bristol. (S.P.C.K. 1910.) 6s.

THE Bishop of Bristol has added another thoroughly characteristic volume to his series of studies of the Anglo-Saxon saints and missionaries. Like its predecessors it is beautifully illustrated, and is obviously the work of an accomplished antiquary. Like them it shews signs of haste; indeed, the Bishop disarms such criticism by the just plea of the pressure of his diocesan duties. In the case of Boniface there is not such full opportunity for the display of the Bishop's special knowledge as in some of his earlier volumes; and his task, in the way he has undertaken it, is not a very severe one. The book largely consists of translations or of *précis* of the ample collection of letters to and from Boniface and his friends which was last edited by Dümmler. The Bishop's comments on these are full of learning, often recondite, and he never fails to make the most of a quaint saying or a good story. Nor does he refrain from his well-known and valiant Anglicanism, or from rapping the Pope's knuckles when the occasion offers. But while we have nothing but praise for the narrator and the antiquary, we sometimes feel that the controversial methods are a little old-fashioned; and we do not think that the story is made as clear as it might have been had the general history of the time been taken fully into account. A scholar so well equipped is doubtless familiar with his Hauck; but he has not learned so much as he might from that great historian. Yet we are always grateful to the Bishop of Bristol for the knowledge which none but he can teach, and which he bestows so ungrudgingly.

Typical English Churchmen. Series II. (S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society. 1909.) 4s.

THE six lives contained in the present volume are fuller than most of those in its predecessor. As in it, there is a certain lack of uniformity. Five of the lives are easy reading though they are good and full history; one, that of Wyclif by Dr.

Figgis, will tax even the special student. It is a scientific and thoroughly impartial essay on Wyclif's thought, fortified with voluminous notes from Wyclif's writings, and assuming a competent knowledge of scholastic methods and of the events of the time, together with access to a good mediaeval library. As it stands first in the book, it may perhaps deter some readers, but it will be well worth their while to turn to the later biographies. Not that Dr. Figgis will fail to reward or to interest them; his wide range of analogies and power of casting light from unexpected quarters are as remarkable as ever, and his statesmanlike view of history as instructive. To turn to his companions, Dr. Spooner, a loyal Wykehamist, takes his founder, and his loyalty is a little too strong for his judgement. William of Wykeham was a great and good man, but there are dubious points in his career, and Mr. Armitage Smith in his *John of Gaunt* takes a less favourable view than the Warden of New College of William's relation to Alice Perrers. It is, indeed, not at all incredible that she gave him such support as certain bishops received from favourites of George II. Canon Scott Holmes is equally loyal to Archbishop Courtenay, and is, in fact, guilty of some special pleading. But he protests so valiantly that the reader must needs be suspicious. Dr. Radford gives a careful account of the very secular Cardinal Beaufort, learned and full, though not of so good literary form as the others. Canon Ross-Lewin writes well on Bishop Tunstall, but has not made him so picturesque a figure as he might have been; and Dr. James Gairdner writes a most erudite and characteristic account of Stephen Gardiner, whom he regards not as a persecutor but as a victim of persecution. Like all Dr. Gairdner's utterances, this deserves most careful consideration. We have a serious charge to make against the book. The revision has been most inadequately performed. There are grave and sometimes perplexing errors in the Latin notes and in the names of books cited. There are occasional lapses in grammar and mistakes of fact, as when Dr. Spooner says that Pleshey, ten miles from London, is in France; and there are elliptic utterances such as that of Dr. Radford on p. 126: 'But his career was drawing at last to its end. Elements of opposition and rivalry (*Ch.Q.R.*).' This is rather flattering to our Review than instructive to the reader. No editor of the volume is mentioned, and the writers seem to have left their manuscripts to chance. In spite of this the volume is really valuable and remarkably cheap.

The English Puritans. By JOHN BROWN, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 1s. net.

THE Cambridge Press is issuing, at the price of one shilling, a series of popular expositions of interesting topics, chiefly historical and scientific. Though all are necessarily elementary, they have been, with the exception of the one before us, objective statements of fact, or at least, where there was a conflict of opinion, considered verdicts. Dr. Brown's is a frankly partisan pamphlet, making out a case for his clients and suppressing the evidence that tells against them. He praises the devotion to civil freedom of the Puritans; in this context the government of England by major-generals under the Commonwealth, the tyranny of Bern over Lausanne, the bondage of colliers and salters under covenanting Scottish earls, and a hundred other instances, are passed by in silence. He lays eloquent stress on Laud's excessive discipline in the matter of worship; he is silent about Laud's liberalism in thought, which was at least as fatal to him when he fell into the hands of crude and proud Puritan dogmatists. But Dr. Brown does not limit himself to the weapon of silence; on occasion he is guilty of flagrant *ex parte* statements, the injustice of which cannot be excused as due to carelessness in a volume on which thought and skill have evidently been expended, and which manifestly represents the sincere convictions of the writer. If the Cambridge Press will commission the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. W. H. Frere, and Abbot Gasquet to treat the same topic, each from his own point of view and with a view to the same audience, we shall have no quarrel with them. Otherwise, we think they would have done well to advise Dr. Brown to issue his work from the Memorial Hall in Farringdon Street.

Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews preserved in the Public Record Office. Vol. II. Edward I. 1273-75. Edited by J. M. RIGG, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law. (Edinburgh: Printed for the Jewish Historical Society of England by Ballantyne, Hanson and Co. 1910.) Price to Non-members, 16s.

NINE years ago Mr. Rigg published a volume of *Select Pleas, Starres and other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, followed later by the first part of a *Calendar*. In the 318 pages of the present volume he gives us a calendar of the Plea Rolls for the first four years of

the reign of Edward I. It is one of those works—painful in more senses than one (for, as he says in the Lecture which serves as an Introduction, the continuous perusal of the Rolls is extremely trying to the sight)—which lay all fellow-students under a deep debt of obligation. The professional student will still turn to the records themselves, but he will do so with the advantage of knowing where what he wants is likely to be found; while those to whom circumstances render this impossible will gain from a study of Mr. Rigg's summaries of the Pleas many illuminating sidelights upon the history of a very interesting period.

The fact that the Jews were, and could be, the only usurers, and on the other hand that they were debarred from holding estates of freehold in land—a rule to which Mr. Rigg has only been able to find two exceptional cases—at once marked out the sphere of their activities and also made it absolutely necessary that, so long as their financial operations were recognized, legal machinery should be created to deal with them. Hence the origin of the Exchequer of the Jews, with its regular forms of procedure, and the establishment of chirograph-chests in the great towns for the security and registration, in a loose sense, of the deeds to which they were parties; while to ensure a measure of justice these chests were placed under the control of two Jewish as well as of two Christian chirographers in each case. As is well known, it was found necessary to restrict the rate of interest which the usurers might charge to *2d.* in the pound a week, or $43\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., but the Jews were, in the eye of the law, the king's chattels, and debts due to them were recoverable by the king as his own. This theory had interesting consequences, for the Jew was subject not to the ordinary taxation, but to a talliage or levy according to the will and necessities of the king, whose method of securing his rights, as appears frequently from these Pleas, was often to lay hold of such of the clearer bonds in the name of the Jew concerned as might be in the chest and enforce the payment of the debt in satisfaction of his own claims. As the talliaiges were heavy, the king had thus a direct interest in seeing that the Christian borrower did not evade his obligations. Not only so, but he was accustomed to grant a share in the talliage or its arrears to third persons in payment of his own debts or for other purposes. Thus we have a grant to 'our dear cousin Edmund of Germany, Earl of Cornwall,' to an amount of 2000 marks borrowed of his father, and grants also to 'the Lady Eleanor, Queen of

England,' whom we find interfering to protect from legal process the 'Warden of our Hospital of St. Katherine in the Tower of London'—an institution which, though removed from the Tower, is still under the exclusive patronage of the Queen Consort of England.

The maximum rate of interest which the Jewish lender might charge may seem a high one, but it must be remembered that for him England, though doubtless a convenient, was also an expensive home. There were legal fees to be paid for leave to move from one town to another or to change his name, fees to be paid for a scrutiny of the Rolls to see if a debtor was keeping to his bond, fees again to escape the invidious office of talliager, to say nothing of fines for an extension of time to pay his talliage and thus avoid imprisonment for his default. Again, if he died a third of his property went to the king by way of death duties, duties which were, however, allowed to be paid by instalments spread over a term of years. If he were excommunicated by Jewish law or became a Christian his property was entirely forfeited to the Crown. In these circumstances it is not surprising to find that the number of converts mentioned in the Pleas is small. To this must be added the inevitable unpopularity attaching to the usurers' occupation—an unpopularity which in important towns such as Winchester and Oxford was proportionate to the extent of their operations. These Pleas contain several suits for redress of attacks on Jewish property, while, as Dr. Rashdall has pointed out, the first time that we find mention of Proctors at Oxford is when they appear before Henry III at Woodstock in 1248 to complain on behalf of the University against the proceedings of the Jews as well as of the burghers. And, as he also notes, a regard for the interest of the scholars led to the establishment of chests, from which they might borrow at an easier rate on the security of some article of personal property.

Naturally the Pleas throw considerable light upon the legal procedure of the time. There are very interesting references to the functions of the coroners. Sometimes, too, the deeds were lost through causes which could not be foreseen, such as the burning of the church of Norwich or the carrying off of the Lincoln chest by the king's enemies, and steps had to be taken to deal with the matter. Again, the king's writ might be directed to the sheriff, but it by no means followed that it would be executed, and the court had to judge how far the fault lay with the official concerned. Sometimes he was

negligent—there is one who is continually 'in mercy'—sometimes he was a rascal and returned the names of the 'mainpernors' or sureties wrongly, as in the case of Henry de Normanton, in which 'the justices are satisfied that there were never any such Jews and that he has fabricated the names.' This sheriff was, unfortunately, a 'parson,' and therefore a writ was directed to the Bishop to distrain his chattels ecclesiastical. Sometimes, however, the sheriff was met with a determined refusal on the part of some great lord like the Earl of Warwick or of Gloucester, or some ecclesiastical dignitary like the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem, to allow the king's writ to be executed within his jurisdiction; there were numberless 'liberties' of persons and places where obedience was easier to command than to enforce, and we find cases, indeed, where obedience was only obtained after long process of law following personal violence to the sheriff himself or to the bailiff concerned.

The charges raised from time to time in the Pleas against the Jews themselves are concerned chiefly with coin-clipping or 'some trifling matter of false money,' for wrongful or excessive distraint or, as in one case, for 'detinue of books,' and in one or two others of false deeds alleged to have been placed in the chirograph-chests with the connivance of its keepers; but the general impression left upon the reader of the Pleas as a whole is not by any means entirely unfavourable, and it is impossible to withhold a certain measure of sympathy for them in the hardness of the measure which led to their expulsion from the country in 1290.

Church Defence. By the Rev. H. J. CLAYTON. Special Lecturer to the Central Church Committee for Defence and Instruction. (Longmans. 1910.) 2s. 6d. net.

THIS is one of the 'Handbooks for the Clergy,' edited by Dr. A. W. Robinson. It is a good book, and worthy of the excellent series in which it stands. Those who devote themselves to such work as 'Church Defence,' in the special sense of resistance to disestablishment and disendowment, are in some danger of sinking into mere advocates, relying on advocates' points, and shewing advocates' dexterity in distorting and obscuring the case of their opponents. Mr. Clayton shews nothing of this: he is fair, moderate, and courteous; and it speaks well for the spirit in which the Central Church Committee goes about its work that one of its principal officers should write with the tone and

temper which are here shown. The book is also written with knowledge, and there are few who would not learn much by a study of it.

Mr. Clayton has had to compress himself within 158 duodecimo pages, and considering this, we are inclined to think that he has devoted more than a due proportion of his space to the defence of the position of the Church of England against Rome. If this part of the book had been somewhat abridged, more room could have been found for dealing with that which is after all more really to the point than any historical argument, namely the practical effect of disestablishment and disendowment on the life and work of the Church. We are far from saying that Mr. Clayton does not deal with this, or that his book does not supply excellent materials for sound thought upon it; but we think they might with advantage have been expanded. We heartily agree with Mr. Clayton in condemning as baseless the notion that establishment crushes independence and zeal, and that if it is removed all that is most fervent and spiritual in the Church will assume control. We think that the case against disendowment might have been put rather more effectively, though we admit that to characterize it properly requires language stronger than Mr. Clayton allows himself. The endowments of the Church are in truth, though not technically, held upon trust for religious purposes, in the same way as are the endowments which nonconformist bodies hold under what are in name, as well as in fact, 'charitable trusts.' It is against all principle, while these purposes are in active existence, and the funds devoted to them undoubtedly required by them, to take away those funds for the mere sake of taking them away, and to apply them to purposes wholly different and certainly not in greater need of help. If indeed the case were made that when the ancient endowments of the Church were granted it was the sole representative of Christianity, and that, now that this is no longer the fact, other bodies which, equally with the Church (as is said), represent Christianity in England, should share in the use of funds dedicated to the common object of them all, it would be a case entitled to respectful consideration. But to deprive an important part of the religious work of the country (we put the case no higher than any honest nonconformist would put it) of money which it urgently needs, and spend it on allotments and free libraries, is one of those projects which, if people could only be induced to see it as it is, would never be heard of again. In writing a book like this it is not

easy to avoid the appearance of defending everything, of being contented with things as they are. This is not really Mr. Clayton's attitude, but (perhaps inevitably) he does not altogether escape the appearance of it. The true position of the 'Church defender' is to deny, not that evils exist, but that disestablishment would remedy them. In Mr. Clayton's words (p. 87): 'What is wanted is not disestablishment, but a clearer setting forth and acting upon the real constitutional relationship between Church and State.' If, for example, establishment really involved the constitutional (as distinct from legal) right of Parliament to legislate for the Church without its consent, or the existence of a secular court of final ecclesiastical appeal, there would be many who would find it difficult to support it. But the truth is that these encroachments, so far from being involved in establishment, are violations of the principle of which this word is a convenient summary, namely the recognition by the State of the immemorial position of the Church as a body with its own organs, both legislative and judicial.

County Churches. Norfolk. By J. CHARLES COX, LL.D., F.S.A. Two Volumes. *Surrey.* By J. E. MORRIS, B.A. One Volume. (George Allen and Sons. 1910.) 2s. 6d. per vol. net.

THESE three volumes form a part of yet another series of illustrated books on archaeological subjects, so many of which are now being published. The first volume of *Norfolk* is preceded by an excellent Introduction dealing with the principal features in the churches and their furniture under their several heads, such as round towers, pre-Conquest work, fonts, screens, etc., and then follow accounts of the churches arranged in deaneries. These accounts are necessarily short, but they are well condensed, and appear to call attention to the main points to be observed in any church. The illustrations are not very numerous, but they are well chosen, and each one has a real purpose. In going through the successive notices of the churches we feel that we are in the company of one who really knows what he is writing about, and we have noted many matters of great interest, to only very few of which we can here refer: such are the reed-thatched churches, many of which remain, though there have been many more, especially in the district of the Broads; the many churches that were destroyed or suffered to go to ruin in the

unsettled and irreligious days of Queen Elizabeth and since; the destructive effects of neglected ivy; the havoc wrought in modern 'restorations'; local saints, as St. Withburga and her well at East Dereham, and Master John Schorne, rector of North Marston in Bucks. The latter was a *quasi* saint, and is often represented as conjuring the devil into a boot; this is thought to be really an allegorical representation of his curing the gout by his prayers or skill—certainly the devil appears to be coming out of the boot, not going in. The carved figures of a pedlar and his dog at Swaffham remind us of a later representation of the same subject in painted glass at St. Mary's, Lambeth. There appear to be some fireplaces, supposed to have been for heating the 'obley-irons,' used in making the altar bread. A very remarkable object is the 'Sexton's Wheel' at Long Stratton, a contrivance for determining the day on which 'Our Lady's Fast' was to begin. At Weasenham All Saints lumps of turf were placed in the free seats, *c.* 1850, for kneeling cushions. Such masses of matted vegetation were called hassocks or tussocks, and were commonly used for this purpose; hence our modern term for kneeling cushions. There are many dials of a primitive kind on the south walls of Norfolk as well as other churches, and it is wonderful that no less than three mistaken theories have been imagined in order to account for these markings, when the famous example at Kirkdale in Yorkshire bears an inscription to the effect that this is day's sunmark at each 'tide' (canonical hour), and one at the neighbouring church of Edstone is inscribed *Orologium viatorum*. These wall-dials are quite common in the Yorkshire Wolds, and the late Daniel Haigh demonstrated their use as dials forty years ago. More is to be said for some of the theories about 'low side windows.' Dr. Cox appears to endorse the very probable view that they were meant for openings at which the sanctus bell was rung before bell-cots on nave-gables came into use. They were certainly sometimes made to open by means of a wooden shutter hung on crooks. At the end of each of the Norfolk volumes we have addenda concerning churches accidentally omitted in their right order, to which lists we may add Garveston, a rather fine village church with a tower that is a landmark. By some unfortunate mischance the first forty-six pages seem not to have been properly revised in proof, consequently they contain about forty-two misprints which should have been avoided, though the reason is partly explained in the Preface. The rest of the book seems to be remarkably free from errors of any kind.

Passing now to Mr. Morris' book, we have to note in the first place that the churches of Surrey are not as a rule nearly so interesting as those of Norfolk. They are mostly small, and plain in character. But many points of interest are referred to in the Introduction: 'the unrivalled Doom at Chaldon, the pre-Conquest tower at Guildford, the earliest brass in England at Stoke d'Abernon, the magnificent Cobham monuments at Lingfield, the doubled-storied chancel at Compton, the pre-Reformation eagle at Croydon, and a series of "low-sides" which, in variety and suggestiveness, is hardly to be rivalled in the kingdom.' Such are what may be called the 'show things' of the county, but all ecclesiologists know that every mediaeval church contains or has contained some point or points of interest all its own. Many of these have been effaced by the 'repairers and beautifiers' of the eighteenth century and many more by the 'restorers' of the nineteenth; still, there is scarcely an old church that is not worth seeing even now, and in his notes on the churches Mr. Morris has made the best of a comparatively barren subject. The writer of this review puzzled long over the inscription to 'Willelmus ternus de Westone,' but read '*deprimit hic lapis iste*,' and supposed that *ternum* here meant 'third of the name.' Monastic versifiers sometimes took strange liberties, as in an inscription lately discovered at Bardney Abbey, which has puzzled many. We suppose that the Saxon letter on p. 78 must stand for *the*, which is expressed by 'y^e' in the same sentence. The confusion between Martha and Martyr, pp. 149, 150, reminds us of Mrs. Gamp's reference to going 'as a Martha to the Stakes.' The illustrations in this volume are good and to the point. We strongly recommend these handy little books to serve as short but comprehensive guides to the churches of the counties to which they relate.

Renaissance Architecture in England. By the Rev. E. HERMITAGE DAY, D.D., F.S.A., 'Arts of the Church' Series, No. 6. (Mowbray. [1910].) 1s. 6d. net.

WE have recently had the pleasure of commending Dr. Hermitage Day's book on 'Gothic Architecture' in the same series as the above.¹ Its successor is no less worthy of praise, and we are glad to see that the illustrations, which are excellent, are dated, as we recommended. Renaissance architecture at

¹ C.Q.R. lxi. 467.

first grew out of Gothic properly so called, and its earliest phase was the introduction of Italian details into Gothic buildings, and then the latest Gothic itself underwent considerable alteration, and assumed the form that the Gothic revivalists of the last century called 'debased.' The earliest phase is seen in the tomb of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey (1512), in a tomb at Layer Marney (c. 1524), in Bishop West's chapel at Ely (1533), in the roodloft at King's College, Cambridge (c. 1534), and in many later works, as in Bishop Cosin's stall-work and font canopy at Durham (c. 1661), where Gothic tabernacle work is supported by shafts with Corinthian capitals. The second phase is seen in many of the college chapels in Oxford and Cambridge, and elsewhere. The third and last phase of the English Renaissance was the adaptation of purely classic or 'pagan' architecture to modern requirements, and the careful avoidance in such buildings of any Gothic detail. This was done with great success by Inigo Jones (1573-1652), Sir Christopher Wren (1632-1723), and Wren's successors. Nearly half of Dr. Day's book is devoted to Sir Christopher, and this portion includes an able and interesting criticism on St. Paul's, a building of which England may well be proud, whatever may be said against it. The exteriors of the dome of St. Paul's and of the graceful steeple of St. Mary-le-Bow in Cheapside are indeed as thoroughly good in their way as the best Gothic work. We cannot imagine how they could possibly be better. The eye and mind rest upon them with perfect satisfaction. But Wren built a great many other churches in London after the Great Fire, and we can hardly imagine a more delightful study than would be afforded by a peregrination of the city churches, with Dr. Day's book in hand. Many are very plain without, but all glorious within. Wren always did the best he could with the money at his disposal, and rightly considered that, in a crowded city especially, the interiors of churches were of more consequence than the exteriors. Nor did he make them mere preaching-houses. He inherited Catholic traditions, and took care to make his east ends as dignified as possible. Proceeding also from the artistic point of view, he took great pains with his towers and spires, that they might assert themselves above the general mass of buildings, and lead up to the western towers and dome of St. Paul's without coming into rivalry with them. These are only specimens of the many interesting points brought out in this admirable little book, and we regret that the limitations of a Short Notice do not admit of our calling

attention to them at greater length. We think that a very good subject for Dr. Day would be 'The Revival of Gothic Architecture in England.' It is remarkable that this revival was itself a Gothic Renaissance, in which the styles have in the main followed their original sequence from Norman to Perpendicular. We may perhaps mention St. James', Morpeth, Romanesque (1846); St. Barnabas, Pimlico, Early English (1850); Doncaster Parish Church, Geometrical (1858); St. Nicholas', Durham, Flowing (1858); and the many churches built in the Perpendicular style during the last few years. And now we have a renaissance of the Renaissance, of which Dr. Day gives examples (1889, 1908).

Memorials of Old Durham. Edited by HENRY R. LEIGHTON,
F.R.Hist.S. (Allen: 1910.) 15s. net.

WE have here another volume of 'County Memorials,' consisting of miscellaneous articles by various hands, the selection of subjects having apparently been determined, as in other volumes in the same series, by the forthcoming of writers willing to deal with them—and from the nature of the case it is to be expected that the articles will differ considerably in merit. We have dealt with the volumes on Yorkshire and Cheshire, and we may now say that the Durham volume contains much that is of great interest, especially to the modern Haliwerfolk, or dwellers within the patrimony of St. Cuthbert. Of all the articles in the book, we think that the first, an Historical Introduction by Dr. Gee, is the ablest and best piece of work, though why a portrait of Bishop William James should be placed opposite to an account of Bishop William of St. Carilef, we are at a loss to see—indeed, throughout the volume, illustrations are interspersed among matter with which they have nothing whatever to do; thus at p. 112 the cellarge under the dormitory of Durham Abbey (c. 1208) is called 'the crypt,' and placed opposite to the description of the refectory cellarge or 'crypt' (1088–1091). And these are only two examples of the vexatious arrangement that prevails. Miss Hope Dodds follows with a topography based on the principal roads, which is very well done, but she ought to have mentioned the barefoot pilgrimage of King Cnut on the *Garmundi via*, now the Sedgfield and Stockton road. A local lady, Mrs. Apperley, gives a very full and interesting account of the folk-lore current in the county; it is impossible to say what is peculiar to any county, if such there be apart from any that has a particular

local reference. A third lady, Miss Cockburn, collects the legends of Durham, but does not refer to the curious story of Hobb of Pelaw, supposed to have jumped from the central tower of the Abbey for a purse of money, and to have left his memorial in a monumental effigy which is, in reality, that of a lady holding a glove, not the purse. Mr. W. M. Egglestone gives a very full account of place-names, in the middle of which comes a view of the gate-house of Kepier Hospital, though not even the name of Kepier occurs in the article, which deals only with the places in the Durham dales. The next article, on Durham Cathedral, is announced as being by Canon Greenwell, and has at first sight the appearance of an original contribution made by him to the present volume. But it seems to consist of passages, not arranged by the author, nor with any direct acknowledgement, from his shilling book, so that the matter itself is beyond any praise of ours. As here given, however, it lacks the references in footnotes, which form so valuable a part of the original work. Mr. Tavernor Perry gives a good and well-illustrated account of Finchale Priory. With the plan, however, we have 'Arms of the Priory,' apparently gu., on each of three escutcheons or, a cinquefoil of the first. We are not aware that the Priory ever used such arms, nor, indeed, that it could have any arms but those of Durham Abbey, of which it was a cell. Mr. Boutflower follows with Monkwearmouth and Jarrow in an article of no less merit than that on Finchale. We wish we could say the same for the account of the Parish Churches of Durham, which anybody might have written with Boyle's *History* at his elbow. 'Monumental Inscriptions,' by Mr. Edwin Dodds, come next, but with the unfortunate mistake of removing the inscription to John Rudde from the formerly collegiate church of Lanchester to the parochial church of Sedgfield, in which connexion the words *quondam decani hujus loci* are a little startling. Mr. H. Leighton gives excellent accounts of the Castles and Halls, and of the Old Families of Durham, between which comes, somewhat incongruously, an article entitled 'Durham Associations of John Wesley,' by the Rev. T. Cyril Dale, B.A. It deals principally with seventeen letters written by Mr. Wesley to a lady, Miss Margaret Dale, of Tunstall, about two miles south of Sunderland, of the same family as the late Canon Thomas Dale, and his son the Rev. Thomas Pelham Dale, of St. Vedast's in the City of London. The letters range from 1765 to 1769, and are written in very affectionate terms. Mr. Wesley, with his zeal for celibacy, especially after his

own unfortunate departure from that state of life, must have been somewhat disappointed to hear the news of his dear Peggy's marriage in 1773 with Mr. Edward Avison, organist of St. Nicholas', Newcastle, 1736-70, the composer of the once popular air sung to 'Sound the loud timbrel.'

VIII.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background. By M. W. MACCALLUM, LL.D., Professor of Modern History in the University of Sydney. (Macmillan. 1910.) 10s. net.

THE three plays of Shakespeare upon Roman subjects, in so generously printed an edition as the new Caxton Edition produced by Mr. Sidney Lee, occupy, with notes, 490 pages. To these Professor MacCallum superadds, in the volume before us, 659 full pages of commentary, and apologizes for having had to omit a supplementary section. He refers to the lack of books in Australia; and it would seem that he has done his best to ensure that Australia shall never want another book dealing with this side of Shakespeare's work. The mind faints at the idea of the remaining thirty-four plays being treated on the same scale.

After preliminary chapters on Roman plays (French and English) in the sixteenth century, and on Shakespeare's treatment of history, we have essays on Plutarch, who provided Shakespeare with practically all the raw material for these three plays; on Amyot, who translated Plutarch; and on North, who translated Amyot. Then follow about 130 pages on *Julius Caesar*, 150 on *Antony and Cleopatra*, and 190 on *Coriolanus*; and finally, thirty pages of appendices, and an index. Evidently there should be no aspect of the plays which is not considered, no character which is not analyzed, and if the student reads any of the plays without full comprehension, it is surely not Professor MacCallum's fault.

The danger is that, if he reads the commentary before the plays, he may be so wearied that he will not read the plays; and if he reads the plays before the commentary, he will find so much of the commentary superfluous and obvious that he will throw it aside. Whatever his intention, Professor MacCallum has succeeded in burying Shakespeare rather than praising him. His work is very sound, very sensible, very complete; but it is not inspiring nor inspired. The best part of it is the full

comparison with Plutarch (quoted in North's version, in which Shakespeare knew it), which shews the great extent of Shakespeare's indebtedness for his material, and likewise the depth and height of the transformation which that material undergoes at his hands. Such a comparison as this, though of course not new, is a real contribution to Shakespearian criticism, and a help, not to comprehension but to an intelligent admiration of the poet's genius. For the rest, the analysis and criticism of the several characters is careful and conscientious, but not specially striking or novel. A reader who wishes to know how some particular scene or personage strikes another, may turn to these pages in reasonable hope of finding it sensibly discussed, but if read continuously the book is somewhat tedious, and cannot well stand the inevitable comparison with Professor Bradley and Professor Raleigh.

The World's Tragedy: and other Poems. By GILBERT WHITE, Bishop of Carpentaria. (Hampstead: Hewetson and Son. 1910.) Price 2s.

Poems. By FREDERICK GEORGE SCOTT. (Constable and Co. 1910.) 5s. net.

THESE books of verse represent the relaxation from arduous work of their respective writers—the one in an Australian pioneer diocese, the other in a large Canadian parish.

Mr. Scott's collection would have made a better, if a smaller volume, had the writings of youth been more sternly excluded. We like best the short poem called *Crucifixion*.

The Bishop of Carpentaria's modest booklet is chiefly distinguished by a very real appreciation of Nature in the tropics. The description in *Gairloch* of a storm is very vivid. A charming thought, entitled *Sand*, is modelled on Henry Vaughan :

' My God, I am as sand :
Of weakness, hid or known,
Convicted if men mock ;
Yet have I heard that sand
By pressure may grow stone :
Make Thou my sand Thy rock.'

The Form of Perfect Living. By RICHARD ROLLE OF HAMPOLE. Rendered into modern English by GERALDINE E. HODGSON, D.Litt. (London: Thos. Baker. 1910.) 3s. 6d.

MISS HODGSON, in an excellent preface, calls attention to the often neglected fact that the English mystic stands high among

his fellows, and Richard Rolle, one of the first to write in the vernacular, is the worthy ancestor of a long line. *The Form of Perfect Living* was written for a nun, Margaret Kirkby, who was bound to him by the same holy ties of affection and discipleship that united St. Clare to St. Francis. In this volume it precedes, by a wise arrangement, the little treatise *On Daily Life*, written for those who desire to live to Christ in the world, not in retreat from it. The difficult matter of adjusting the claim of the naïveté of the original to that of the present day for unambiguous clearness has been dealt with sanely and simply. No archaism is retained for affectation; but the little inversions of style and some Anglo-Saxon words of obvious meaning are happily retained. It is satisfactory that people should at last be able to make acquaintance with the simple straightforwardness, the searching perception, and the tender strength of our earliest great mystic.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. XII. No. 45. October 1910. Frowde). Very Rev. J. H. Bernard: 'The Odes of Solomon.' A. Souter: (1) 'Another new Fragment of Pelagius.' From MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 653; (2) 'Patristica.' M. R. James: (1) 'A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter'; (2) 'The *Epistola Apostolorum* in a New Text'; (3) 'Additional Notes on the Apocalypse of Peter.' W. V. Hague: 'The Eschatology of the Apocryphal Scriptures.' C. H. Turner: (1) 'The Early Greek Commentators on the Gospel according to St. Matthew'; (2) 'The Bibliography of Jean du Tillet.' H. St. J. Thackeray: 'A New Name (not Another Name), Is. lxxv 15.' R. H. Kennett: 'The Prophecy in Is. ix 1-7 (a Reply to Dr. Burney).' C. F. Burney: 'Four and Seven as Divine Titles.' J. K. Fotheringham: 'Astronomical Evidence for the Date of the Crucifixion.' A. H. McNeile: 'Tote in St. Matthew.' E. C. Selwyn: 'On *Psêlaphōmenō* in Heb. xii 18.' J. H. Srawley: 'Goguel *L'Eucharistie, des origines à Justin Martyr*.' J. F. Bethune-Baker: 'Tixeront *Histoire des Dogmes*, II' (318-430); 'Burkitt *Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*.' H. L. Jackson: 'Montefiore *The Synoptic Gospels*.' P. C. T. Crick: 'Savage *The Gospel of the Kingdom*.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. IX. No. 1. October 1910. Williams and Norgate). P. Sabatier: 'De la situation religieuse de l'Église Catholique romaine, en France, à l'heure actuelle.' G. Murray: 'Hellenistic Philosophy.' P. E. Matheson: 'Ideals in Education.' A. W. Vernon: 'The Present Crisis of the Christian Religion.' 'A Vision of Unity (The World's Missionary Conference, 1910).' By the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. A. M. F. Cole: 'Fragments of a Dual Consciousness.' J. H. Hyslop: 'Philosophical Theories and Psychological Research.' T. Holmes: 'Prisons and Prisoners.' M. A. R. Toker: 'The Words of Institution at the Last Supper.' G. C. Field: 'The Fallacy of the Social Psychologist.' F. H. Low: 'Principal Childs on Woman Suffrage. A Rejoinder.' H. B. Alexander: 'The Belief in God and Immortality as Factors in Race Progress.' J. Drummond: 'Bacon *The Fourth Gospel*' (8½ pp.). J. M. Thompson: 'Sanday *Christologies Ancient and*

Modern (4 pp. interesting). G. E. French: '*Schweitzer The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.' T. K. Cheyne: '*Harris The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*' (5½ pp.). A. R. Whately: '*Inge Faith and its Psychology*.' A. Boutwood: '*Lebreton Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité, I.*' J. A. Hill: '*S. Butler Unconscious Memory*' [reprint].

The London Quarterly Review (No. 228. October 1910. Culley). W. T. Davison: '*The Church and the World in the Twentieth Century*.' J. Agar Beet: '*Saving Faith*.' W. H. Findlay: '*Sight, Sound, and Silence at Edinburgh*' [The Missionary Conference]. J. Telford: '*Snead-Cox Life of Cardinal Vaughan*.' W. B. Brash: '*The Teaching of Jesus—a Study in Method*.' C. Bone: '*Windows into Chinese Minds*.' C. A. Harris: '*Music as influenced by the Reformation*.' W. T. Davison: '*Gladstone's Letters on Religion*.' J. S. Banks: '*Kittel Das Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.' J. G. Tasker: '*J. Weiss u. G. Grützmacher Die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu*.' R. W. Moss: '*Brailsford The Spiritual Sense in Sacred Legend*.' E. S. Waterhouse: '*Prof. W. James*.' C. R. Smith: '*The Name "Jew" in the N.T.*' '*Okuma Fifty Years of New Japan*' (2nd edit. monumental). '*Marczali Hungary in the XVIIIth Century*.' '*A. Leger La jeunesse de Wesley*.' '*R. de Bary Franciscan Days of Vigil*.' '*Bishop of Bristol Boniface of Crediton*' (laudatory). '*H. A. L. Fisher F. W. Maitland*.' '*G. G. Coulton A Mediaeval Garner*.' '*U. Chevalier Hymnes et Proses inédites de Claude Santeul*.' '*Bishop of Stepney Home Life in England*.'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXLVII. No. 295. October 1910. Burns and Oates). W. Ward: '*Cardinal Vaughan*,' II. Hon. M. Baring: '*The Causes of the Failure of the Russian Revolution*.' G. K. Chesterton: '*What is Toleration?*' C. C. Martindale, S.J.: '*A Note on Comparative Religion*.' (The late) F. Thompson: '*Carmen Genesis. A Poem*.' J. S. Phillimore: '*St. Paulinus of Nola*.' Sir F. C. Burnand: '*Punch and Pontiffs*.' '*The Lay Paradise*.' Sir F. Lugard: '*A University for Hong Kong*.' '*The Answer to Socialism*.' Mgr. M. J. Bidwell: '*Spain and the Church*.' '*Gladstone's Letters on Church and Religion*.' '*Gwatkin Early Church History to 313 and Bigg Origins of Christianity*' (critical). '*Hymns Ancient and Modern*. Historical Edition.' '*G. S. Hitchcock Higher Criticism of Isaiah*.' '*Haile Life of Reginald Pole*.' '*Stratford Edward IV*' (favourable). '*Oman England before the Norman Conquest*.' B. C. A. W[indle]: '*Chart Ireland from the Union to Catholic Emancipation*'; '*Peet The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*'; '*Wasmann Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution*.' '*Turquan Madame Royale, the Last Dauphine*' [E.T.]. F. [de] Z[ulueta]: '*Fisher F. W. Maitland*.'

The Irish Church Quarterly (Vol. III. No. 12. October 1910. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis). Bishop of Ossory: '*The World Missionary Conference and some of its Lessons*.' Hon. E. Lyttelton: '*Thoughts on Religious Education*.' E. J. Gwynn: '*Sir Samuel Ferguson*.' G. V. Jourdan: '*A Moderate Reformer—Lefèvre d'Étaples*.' T. S. Berry: '*The Atonement. A Reply*.' R. M. Gwynn: '*The Dublin University Mission to Fuh-Kien. II. The History of the D.U.F.M. Province*.' N. J. D. W[hite]: '*Swete (and others) Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day*.' '*Joyce The Inspiration of Prophecy*.' '*C. H. Robinson The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to non-Christian Races*' ('altogether admirable'). '*Westcott The Two Empires*' (critical). '*Gwatkin Early Church History to 313*.' '*Atchley History of the Use of Incense in Divine Worship*.' '*J. K. Mozley Ritschlianism*.' '*L. Paul-Dubois Contemporary Ireland*.' '*C. L. Falkiner Essays relating to Ireland, biographical, historical and topographical*.' '*Plummer Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*.' '*Webster Church Plate of the Diocese of Cork, Cloyne and Ross*.' '*R. A. S. MacAlister The Memorial Slabs of Clonmacnois*.' '*J. McCabe The Decay of the Church of Rome*.'

The Irish Theological Quarterly (Vol. V. No. 20. October 1910. Dublin: Gill). W. Turner: 'Was John the Scot a Heretic?' W. T. C. Sheppard: 'The Teaching of the Fathers on Divorce.' J. Kelleher: 'The Right to Rent and the Unearned Increment.' C. Plater: 'A Plea for the Prophets.' J. J. Tookey: 'Newman on the Criterion of Certitude.' P. Coffey: 'Philosophy and Sectarianism in Belfast University.' C. J. Callan: 'The Nature and Possibility of Miracles.' M. J. O'Donnel: 'H. C. King *The Ethics of Jesus*.' J. MacRory: 'Heer *Evangelium Gatanum*.' Lagrange *Quelques Remarques sur l'Orpheus de M. Salomon Reinach*. Batiffol *Orpheus et l'Évangile*. J. O'Neill: 'Walker *Theories of Knowledge*.' J. M. Harty: 'Ryan *The Church and Interest-Taking*.' P. J. Toner: 'A. Le Roy *La Religion des Primitifs*.' P. Coffey: 'Arnaudet *Genèse et Science*.' C. Coupe, S.J., *Continuity* (a Reply to the Bishop of London).

The Interpreter (Vol. VII. No. 1. October 1910. Simpkin, Marshall). Bishop of Durham: 'Impressions of the Edinburgh Conference.' A. Menzies: 'The Odes of Solomon.' W. Emery Barnes: 'Divine Guidance in the Old Testament.' W. F. Adeney: 'St. John, Papias, and Professor Bacon.' H. D. A. Major: 'The Gospel of Freedom.' H. E. B. Speight: 'Personality, Modern Psychology and Religion.' C. Noel: 'Catholic Dogma and Originality.' O. C. Whitehouse: 'The Condition of Egypt and Western Asia, 1700-1200 B.C.' F. W. Lewis: 'Misinterpretations in the Fourth Gospel,' II. [St. John xi 51-2; xii 6, 16, 33; xviii 32]. H. W. Hogg: 'Orientalia.' A. L. Lilley *The Soul of St. Paul and The Religion of Life*. Chadwick *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity*. Oesterley *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*. Joyce *The Inspiration of Prophecy*.

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XIV. No. 4. October 1910. Chicago University Press). C. E. Seashore: 'The Play Impulse and Attitude in Religion.' G. H. Gilbert: 'The Greek Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews.' I. King: 'The Religious Significance of the Psychotherapeutic Movement.' W. H. Allison: 'Was Newman a Modernist?' J. B. Pratt: 'A Mistake in Strategy.' C. W. Votaw: 'Four Principles underlying Religious Education.' G. M. Youngman: 'MSS. of the Vulgate in the British Museum.' Useful. L. W. Batten: 'Curtis and Madsen *Chronicles*.' W. G. Jordan: 'Kent *The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*.' M. Sprengling: 'Harris *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*.' E. J. Goodspeed: 'Flemming u. Harnack *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem Ersten Jahrhundert*.' J. W. Thompson: 'The History of the Jesuits.' J. W. Moncrief: 'Usher *The Reconstruction of the English Church*.' Hobhouse *The Church and the World*. W. C. Keirstead: 'Fairbairn *Studies in Religion and Theology*.' D. C. Macintosh: 'Personal Idealism, Pragmatism and the New Realism' (6 pp.). W. T. Paullin: 'Ladd *Knowledge, Life and Reality*.' C. A. Exley: 'Buckham *Personality and the Christian Ideal*.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. VIII. No. 4. October 1910. Princeton University Press). W. H. Johnson: 'Miracles and History.' B. B. Warfield: '"Scripture," "The Scriptures," in the New Testament.' H. M. Robinson: 'The Text of Luke xxii 17-25' (45 pp.). W. B. Greene, jr.: 'R. D. Hicks *Stoic and Epicurean*.' Hibben *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. T. C. Hall *Social Solutions in the Light of Christian Ethics*. E. H. Kellogg: 'C. C. Hall *Christ and the Eastern Soul*' (10 pp.). G. M. Russell: 'R. F. Horton *Great Issues*.' G. Vos: 'Swete *The Holy Spirit in the N.T.*' W. H. Johnson: 'King *The Ethics of Jesus*.' B. B. Warfield: 'D. H. Fleming *The Reformation in Scotland*' (5 pp.). Seeberg *Revelation and Inspiration* (9 pp.). C. W. Hodge: 'Forsyth *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*.' B. F. Paist, jr.: 'T. B. Neely *South America: Its Missionary Problems*.' J. S. Gale *Korea in Transition*.

The Review and Expositor (Vol. VII. No. 4. October 1910. Louisville, Ky.). B. J. Anderson: 'Aspects of the Theologian's Relation to the Progress of Theology.' C. Burrage: 'The Collegiants or Rynsbergers of Holland through whose Co-operation the Members of the First Immersionist English Anabaptist Congregation in London procured their Baptism in 1641.' R. W. Weaver: 'The Emerging Issue.' W. R. L. Smith: 'Jesus and His Adversaries.' J. L. Kesler: 'The Preacher and Biology.' S. G. Woodrow: 'Sabatier's Theory of Religious Knowledge.' D. F. Estes: 'C. R. Gregory *Wellhausen und Johannes*.' A. T. Robertson: 'Milligan *Selections from the Greek Papyri*'; Schweitzer *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*'; 'Sanday *Christologies*'; 'Wendland *Der Wunderglaube in Christentum*.' C. S. Gardner: 'Sichtenberger *Divorce. A Study in Social Causation*.' J. Ten Broeke: 'Ladd *Knowledge, Life and Reality*.' W. O. Carver: 'Rashdall *Philosophy and Religion*'; 'Boutroux *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* [E.T.]'; 'P. Mauro *The Number of Man*'; 'H. M. Dale *Religion, its Place and Power*' ('an unusual work'). W. J. McGlothlin: 'Tyrrell *Christianity at the Cross Roads*.'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (N.S. Vol. I. No. 2. October 1910. Philadelphia: Dropsie College. London: Macmillan). H. Malter: 'Shem Tob ben Joseph Palquera. A Thinker and Poet of the Thirteenth Century.' I. Friedlaender: 'Jewish-Arabic Studies,' I. V. Aptowitzer: 'The Influence of Jewish Law on the Development of Jurisprudence in the Christian Orient.' I. Davidson: 'Poetic Fragments from the Genizah. II. From a Divan of a North African Poet.' From Taylor-Schechter Collection, Loan No. 58. Hebrew Texts. I. Friedlaender: (1) 'Jews of Arabia and the Gaonate'; (2) 'Arabian Jews and Rechabites'; (3) 'Bonfires on Purim.' M. L. Margolis: 'The Grouping of the Codices in the Greek Joshua.' W. Bacher: 'Margolis *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud*' (9 pp. With Note by Prof. Margolis). I. Husik: 'Friedlaender *Selections from the Arabic Writings of Maimonides*'; 'Bentwich *Philo Judaeus of Alexandria*.' A. Marx: 'Pereferkowsitch *Talmud Babylonicum*.'

The Expositor (Nos. 58-60. October-December 1910. Hodder and Stoughton). W. P. Paterson: 'Divorce and the Law of Christ.' B. D. Erdmans: 'Ezra and the Priestly Code.' F. Y. Leggatt: 'Job's Contribution to the Problem of the Future State.' J. Orr: 'Sin as a Problem of To-day. IX. Sin as Guilt—The Divine Judgment' (Nov. X. 'Sin and the Divine Remedy—Eternal Issues and Theodicy.'). E. W. Maunder: 'A Misinterpreted Miracle' (Joshua x 12-13). A. Souter: 'The Influence of Persecution on Certain New Testament Writings.' J. Moffatt: 'The Outlook in New Testament Criticism.' November. H. M. Wiener: 'Has Dr. Skinner vindicated the Graf-Wellhausen Theory?' K. Lake: 'The Earliest Christian Teaching on Divorce.' R. Winterbotham: 'The Four Empires of Daniel.' H. E. Hill: 'Historic Christianity and the Mystical Sense.' E. C. Selwyn: 'The Carefulness of Luke. II. Peter's Conversion.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Grace and Freewill. The Teaching of the Gospel and the Rabbis contrasted.' J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan: 'Lexical Notes from the Papyri,' XIX. (Dec. XX). December. F. W. Mozley: 'Justification by Faith in St. James and St. Paul.' K. Lake: 'The Shorter Form of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.' J. de Zwaan: 'Psalm XLV.' A. Carr: 'Further Notes on the Synoptic Problem.' I. Gregory Smith: 'The Promises of Reward,' J. Moffatt: 'Materials for the Preacher.'

The Expository Times (Vol. XXII. Nos. 1-3. October-December 1910. T. and T. Clark). R. H. Strachan: 'The Newly Discovered Odes of Solomon and their Bearing on the Problem of the Fourth Gospel.' F. H. Woods: 'Note on Ezek. xxxii 17-32.' A. H. Sayce: 'E. A. Gordon *Messiah, the Ancestral Hope of the Ages*'; 'Clay *Amurru, the*

Home of the Northern Semites. A. R. Gordon: 'I. Davidson *Parody in Jewish Literature.*' J. M. Lister: 'The Muhammadan "Corner"' (Dec. Note by T. Hudson-Williams). W. H. Griffith Thomas: 'Heb. ii 14.' W. S. Rutherford: 'The Seamless Coat.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story.' November. 'Sturtism.' A. Plummer: 'The Witness of the Four Gospels to the Doctrine of a Future State.' R. M. Pope: 'Studies in Pauline Vocabulary. Of "Earnest Expectation"' [Rom. viii 19, Ph. i 20]. W. W. Holdsworth: 'The Life of Faith.' T. G. Pinches: 'The Date of Prof. Hilprecht's new Deluge Fragment.' G. A. Barton: 'The Twelfth Line of Hilprecht's Deluge Tablet.' E. Nestle: (1) 'Jah'; (2) 'David in the Book of Job?'; (3) 'Death of St. John in the Seventh Year of Trajan' [from 'Delaporte *Chronographie d'Élie bar-Sinaya, métropolitain de Nisibe*']. A. E. N. Hitchcock: 'Eph. i 23.' 'Snead-Cox *Life of Cardinal Vaughan.*' December. O. C. Whitehouse: 'Eberhard Schrader.' W. K. L. Clarke: 'The Allegorical Element in the Fourth Gospel.' K. Lake: '2 Thessalonians and Prof. Harnack.' S. Langdon: 'Concerning "Jahweh" in Lexicographical Babylonian Tablets.' H. F. B. Compston: (1) 'Jah'; (2) 'The Name "David" in O.T.' 'G. Brown *Melanesians and Polynesians.*'

The Churchman (Vol. XXIV. Nos. 58-60. October-December 1910. E. Stock). J. Orr: 'Principal Skinner on Genesis.' T. H. S. Escott: 'The Last of an Old Line' [The Rev. H. S. Escott of Kilve]. F. S. G. Warman: 'The Essentials of Evangelicalism.' A. Plummer: 'Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church. V. The Venerable Bede' (Dec. VI. 'Monasticism'). W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Study of the Septuagint Version of Amos.' W. St. C. Tisdall: 'The Origin of Christianity.' D. G. Whitley: 'de Lapparent *La Providence Créatrice.*' W. E. Chadwick: 'Frazer *Totemism and Exogamy.*' W. St. C. Tisdall: 'Harris *Odes and Psalms of Solomon*'; 'Girdlestone *Outlines of Bible Chronology*'; 'U. Z. *Rule Old Testament Institutions.*' 'Garstang *Land of the Hittites.*' 'Joyce *Inspiration of Prophecy.*' November. H. Lewis: 'The Rise of the Anglican Laity to Place and Power,' I (Dec. II). J. Nunn: 'The Ornaments Rubric and the Convocations of Canterbury and York.' C. F. Russell: 'Establishment and the Moral Witness of the Church.' W. F. Kimm: 'The Reformation under Josiah.' M. B. Whiting: 'Edmund Halley.' 'Wickham *Hebrews.*' December. H. E. H. Probyn: 'The Authority of our Lord in the Synoptic Gospels.' E. J. Wolfe: 'Verbal Revision of the Prayer-Book.' W. L. Pilter: 'The Generations of Shem (Gen. xi 10-26).' J. Warren: 'Sentimentality.' 'Deissmann *Light from the Ancient East*' [E.T.]. D. J. Davies: 'L. H. Waring *The Political Theories of Luther.*' H. J. R. Marston: 'Hole *Manual of English Church History.*' W. St. C. Tisdall: 'Margolis *Manual of the Aramaic Language in the Babylonian Talmud.*'

The English Church Review (Vol. I. Nos. 10-11. October-November 1910. Longmans). Lord W. Gascoyne-Cecil: 'Indigenous Christianity.' 'Church Troubles at Brighton.' W. C. Piercy: 'The Revisers' New Testament and the New Principles of Textual Criticism,' II. 'Confession according to the Prayer-Book,' II. J. P. Whitney: 'The Jesuits at the Council of Trent.' Lady C. Emmott: 'Some Plain Words about "Christian Science."' 'Darwell Stone *The Invocation of Saints.*' November. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E.: 'Careless Baptisms and the Transmission of the Apostolic Ministry.' W. J. Sparrow Simpson: 'The Present Undesirability of Prayer-Book Revision.' Darwell Stone: 'Anglicans and the Church of Rome.' 'Transubstantiation and the Real Presence.' 'Some Letters on Reservation.' By Drs. Pusey, Bright, Liddon, Fr. Benson and Rev. R. W. Randall. 'Bishop of Vermont *The Apostolic Ministry.*' 'Letters of J. M. Neale.'

The Catholic World (Vol. XCII. Nos. 547-9. October-December 1910. New York: 120-122 West 60th St.). H. Belloc: 'The Catholic Conscience of History' (Dec. 'What was the Roman Empire?'). L. I. Guiney: 'St. "Bertram" of Ilam.' W. St. Oswald: 'In Carra and Tirawley, County Mayo.' (Nov. 'The Work of Irish Sisters'). K. Brégy: 'The Passionsspiele of 1910.' W. Elliott: 'Tauler's Place among Preachers.' H. É. O'Keefe: 'Cardinal Vaughan in America' [The 'Colour Question']. 'Haile Life of Reginald Pole.' 'Croly The Promise of American Life.' 'Thanet By Inheritance' [The Negro]. 'Batiffol Orpheus et l'Évangile.' 'Wiener Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism' (critical). 'Grasset The Gospel and Sociology.' November. C. C. Martindale: 'The History of Religions.' J. McSorley: 'The Catholic Layman and Social Reform.' C. Coleman: 'The Vandalism of the Reformers.' W. E. Campbell: 'Chesterton What's Wrong with the World.' W. H. Kent: 'Snead-Cox Life of Cardinal Vaughan.' A. B. Purdie: 'Francis Thompson: His Life and Work.' 'Moulard et Vincent Apologétique Chrétienne.' December. 'The Journal of my Life.' By a Nun. W. H. G. Flood: 'Anglo-Irish Christmas Carols.' R. S. F. L.: 'Father Lambert.' The opponent of Ingersoll. J. F. Scholfield: 'The Catholic Revival in Denmark and Iceland.' 'E. Kelley Twentieth Century Socialism.' 'Wasmann Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution.' 'Butler The Pittsburg Survey. Women and the Trades' and 'Eastman Work-Accidents and the Law' (issued by the Charities Publication Committee, New York). 'Bellaigue Gounod.'

The Edinburgh Review (No. 434. October 1910. Longmans). 'The War against Disease.' 'Philip van Artevelde.' 'The Copyright Question.' 'Academical Oratory.' 'The Mind of Cavour.' 'The Gothic Contribution to Renaissance Art.' 'Eastern Art and Western Critics.' 'The English Clergy in Fiction.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 425. October 1910. Murray). Sir M. Conway: 'Four great Collections' (Buckingham Palace and Windsor, Wilton House, Lord Radnor's, Dr. Mond's, of Pictures). S. Lane Poole: 'The Author of *Vathek*.' C. H. Herford: 'Dante's Theory of Poetry.' W. Barry: 'The Problem of Pascal.' 'The Promise of Latin America.' 'Copyright Law Reform.' 'Gladstone on the Relations of Church and State.' H. Cox: 'The Position of Trade Unions.' 'Spain and the Vatican.'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXV. No. 100. October 1910. Longmans). N. H. Baynes: 'Rome and Armenia in the Fourth Century.' R. Flenley: 'London and Foreign Merchants in the Reign of Henry VI.' H. P. Smith: 'Luther and Henry VIII.' W. Hooper: 'The Court of Faculties.' L. F. Salzmänn: 'Early Fines.' F. M. Powicke: 'The Pleas of the Crown in the Avranchin.' A. Ballard: 'Castle-Guard and Barons' Houses.' C. E. Johnston: 'Sir William Oldhall.' C. Burrage: 'The Fifth Monarchy Insurrections.' J. H. Rose: 'Papers relating to the Irish Rebellion of 1798.' Sir F. Pollock: 'Fehr *Hammurapi und das salische Recht*.' W. A. Goligher: 'Francotte, *Les Finances des Cités Grecques*.' (unfavourable). F. de Zulueta: 'Gelzer *Studien zur Byzantinischen Verwaltung Aegyptens*.' J. Tait: 'Baring *Domesday Tables*.' 'Tingey *Records of Norwich*.' H. A. G. Little: 'Pennacchi *Legenda S. Clare Virginis* and 'Robinson *Life of St. Clare*.' J. P. Whitney: 'Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi*, II.'; 'Pérouse *Le Cardinal Louis Aleman*.' C. H. Firth: 'Michael *Cromwell*.' R. W. Lee: 'Records of Madras Government: *Dutch Records*, I.-X.' L. G. Wickham Legg: 'Mathiez *Le Club des Cordeliers*.' J. H. Gubbins: 'Uyehara *Political Development of Japan, 1867-1909*.' F. Watson: 'Stocks *Records of Blackburn Grammar School*.' 'Dictionary of English History, 2nd edit.' (scathing). S. A. C[ook]: 'Kittel *Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.'

Jörgensen *Helgendyrkelse i Danmark.* 'Gertz Vitae Sanctorum sanorum' (Theodgar and Knut).

The Economic Review (Vol. XX. No. 4. October 1910. Rivingtons). M. Conacher: 'The State as an Agent for securing Distributive Justice.' (C. Pringle: 'Labour in Japan.' C. V. Butler: '"Public Assistance" and Organized Charities in Oxford.' R. H. Tawney: 'Municipal Enterprise in Germany.' J. L. Dougan: 'Legislation, Parliamentary Inquiries, and Official Returns.' W. A. Spooner: 'Chance Poor Law Reform. A Tertia'; 'Webb English Poor Law Policy.' N. P. Williams: 'Ottley Christian Ideas and Ideals.' H. E. Egerton: 'Foster English Factories in India, 1630-3.' D. A. Barker: 'Wolff People's Banks'; 'Veiller Housing Reform' (issued by the New York Charities Publication Committee).

Hermathena (No. XXXVI. 1910. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis). H. F. Merry: 'Probable Early Students of Trinity College, Dublin (being Wards of the Crown), 1599-1616.' E. S. Dodgson: 'Doctrina Christianaren explicacioa . . . etc. Urte 1713. Donostian: Pedro de Ugarte-ren thean.' A Study in Basque. M. Esposito: (1) 'Notes on Mediaeval Ibero-Latin and Ibero-French Literature'; (2) 'Analecta Varia,' II. MSS. in Basel Universitätsbibliothek). H. A. Clay: 'Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung.' G. Wilkins: 'The Prayer of Manasseh.' Syriac text from MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. syr. 7. T. K. Abbott: 'Gwynn Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible.' A. H. Sayce: 'Dodgson The Gicarragan Verb (St. Matthew) and Le Verbe basque (Epistola ad Hebraeos).' Arnall Cults of the Greek States, V.' W. M. Lindsay *Early Irish Manuscript Script.*

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 538-40. October-December 1910. George Marshall). W. M. Rossetti: 'Reminiscences of Holman Hunt.' Nov.-Dec. Reprint of Holman Hunt's 'The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Fight for Art,' I-II, from C.R. Apl. 1886). W. E. Soothill: 'The Educational Conquest of China.' D. McGillivray: 'The Chinese and the Comet.' H. W. Massingham: 'The Modern Press and its Public.' J. Putnam: 'The Lady of the Blue Stockings.' (Nov. 'The Lady the Slave States.' Dec. 'The Lady summarised'). W. Scott Palmer: 'Freedom and its Armageddon.' W. F. Stead: 'Can Telepathy explain All?' (The late) J. Churton Collins: 'Browning and Butler.' Emery Barnes: 'An Ancient Instance and a Modern Want.' (Alexandrian Christianity and?). 'Pernot La Politique de Pie X.' J. E. G. M[ontmorency]: 'Fisher F. W. Mailland.' 'Uyehara Political Development of Japan, 1867-1909.' November. 'The Church and Marriage.' By a Country Parson. [A deliberate proposal of recognition of two kinds of Marriage—one contractual, the other sacramental.] E. M. Willard: 'Imagination and the Ideal.' E. Anker: 'Björnson and his Christianity.' 'Cambridge History of English Literature, V.-VI.' 'Formby the American Civil War.' 'Podmore Mesmerism and Christian Science.' Askwith *Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel.* 'Busbey Home Life in America.' December. C. S. Rossie: 'Cheap Meat. The German Veibank' (horrible). E. E. Anderson: 'Our Knowledge of Jesus in the Light of Modern Research.' Count S. C. de Soissons: 'Anatole France,' I. M. Longman: 'Children's Care Committees.' 'Acton Lectures on the French Revolution.' 'Current Theological Books.'

The Hindustan Review (Vol. XXII. Nos. 133-6. September-December 1910. Allahabad: 7 Elgin Road). S. C. Mitra: 'A Common Language for India.' By a former Judge of Calcutta High Court. K. Sain: 'The Influence of European Science on Indian Thought,' II. J. Samaddar: 'Ancient India's Commercial Relations,' II (Oct.-Nov. III). S. Radhakrishnan: 'The Relation of Morality and Religion.' A. K. Coomaraswamy: 'Parker Ancient Ceylon.' L. W. King *History of Sumer and*

Akkad. 'Foster *English Factories in India*, IV (1630-33).' 'Ket. *History of Caste in India.*' October-November. C. H. Rao: 'Contact between East and West. A Historical Study.' J. N. Sen: 'The Nation of India—Education.' 'A Common-sense View of Nirvana.' 'F. *Through Persia from the Gulf to the Caspian.*' December. Shai Muhammad Iqbal: 'Political Thought in Islam.' I. E. Greaves: 'Hinduism and the National Movement.' Lajpat Rai: 'Wanted an Anti-Consumption Campaign.' D. J. Kapadia: 'Religious Reform among the Parsees.' 'Raja Sir Harnam Singh—the Indian Christian.' R. Bonnerji: 'National Life and National Character.' 'Chailley *Administrative Problems of Modern India*' (8 pp.). 'The Scenes and Sights of Allahabad.'

Analecta Bollandiana (Tom. XXIX. Fasc. iv. November 1910. Brussels: 22, Boulevard Saint-Michel). Z. Garcia: 'La lettre de Valérius aux moines du Vierzo. sur la bienheureuse Aetheria.' C. van de Vorse: 'La vie grecque de S. Léon le Grand.' Greek Text from MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 36589. A. Poncelet: 'La translation des SS. Eleuthère, Pontien et Anastase.' In MS. Neapol. Bibl. Nat. VI. AA. 4. H. Delehay: (1) 'Les premiers "Libelli miraculorum"'; (2) 'Gaianopolis.' U. Chevalier: 'Repertorium Hymnologicum.' Supplementum alterum. A. Poncelet: 'Mombritius Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum' (reprint); 'Krusch: *Levison Passiones Vitaeque sanctorum aevi merovingici*' (7 pp.); 'Gerhard: *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, II.' H. Delehay: 'Hamilton: *Greek Saints and their Festivals*'; 'Lawson: *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*'; 'Marucchi: *Epigrafia Cristiana*'; 'Donaldson: *Church Life and Thought in N. Africa*'; 'Monceaux: *L'épigraphie donatiste*'; 'Kehrer: *Die heiligen drei Könige in Litteratur u. Kunst*'; 'Guignebert: *La primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre à Rome*' (critical); 'Conybeare: *Ring of Pope Xystus*.' P. P[oncelet]: 'Tournèze: *Histoire politique religieuse de l'Arménie*'; 'Ormanian: *L'Eglise arménienne*.' [C.] v[an] d[e] V[orst]: 'Rouillon: *S. Hélène*'; 'Regnier: *S. Léon le Grand*.' J. Moretus: 'Künstle: *Vita S. Genovefae*'; 'Camerlinck: *S. Léger, évêque d'Autun*, 616-78'; 'Funk: *Jakob von Vitry*.' [F.] v[an] O[rtroy]: 'Glaser: *Die Franziskanische Bewegung*'; 'Ott: *Thomas von Aquin*.' 'Kingsford-Little-Tocco: *Fr. Joannis Pecham tractatus tres de Paupertate*.' 'Bryce: *Scottish Grey Friars*.'

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien (N.S. Vol. V. No. 3. 1910. Paris: Picard). F. Nau: (1) 'La cosmographie au VII^e siècle chez les Syriens'; (2) 'Note sur le texte grec original du *Sargis d'Aberga* éthiopien'; (3) 'Un nouveau MS. du martyrologe de Rabban Sliba.' MS. Bibl. Vat. Borg. syr. 129. L. Leroy: 'Un apocryphe carchouni sur la captivité à Babylone (texte arabe, traduction française).' From MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. syr. 65. E. W. Brooks: 'La lettre de Nestorius aux habitants de Constantinople (texte syriaque, traduction française).' From MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 14597 and Add. 12154. E. Blochet: 'Babylone dans les historiens chinois.' P. Dib: 'Jules d'Aqfahs.' S. Grébaud: (1) 'Littérature éthiopienne pseudo-clémentine. Texte et traduction (traité sur la seconde-venue du Christ et la résurrection des morts, VII^e siècle)'; (2) 'Traduction de la version éthiopienne d'une homélie de Firmilien, évêque de Césarée.' E. Tisserand: 'Note sur des fragments de Schenoute conservés dans les livres d'office.' From MSS. Bibl. Vat. Borg. arab. 5 and Vat. arab. 60. M. Brière: 'Brooks: *Hymns of Severus of Antioch*.' F. Nau: 'Vasiliev: *Kitab al 'Unwan, Histoire Universelle, par Agapi (Mahboub) de Menbidj*.'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. XI. No. 4. October 1910. Louvain: 40, rue de Namur). J. Flamion: 'Les actes apocryphes de Pierre,' VIII. F. Callaey: 'Les idées-mystico-politiques d'un franciscain spirituel. Étude sur l'*Arbor vitae* d'Ubertin de Casale,' II. P. Richard

- gines et développement de la Secrétairerie d'État apostolique (1417-1433), III. J. Warichez: 'Vacandard Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse.' C. van Crombrughe: 'B. Weiss Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des N.T.,' 'v. Hertling Augustin'; 'Thimme Augustins tätige Entwicklung'; 'Scheel Die Anschauung Augustins über Christusson u. Werk.' L. Vanhalst: 'Dorsch Die Opfercharakter der Eucharistie'; 'Wieland Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff.' P. de Puniet: 'Hatchley The Ambrosian Liturgy'; 'Wainewright The Office for the Commemoration of SS. Peter and Paul according to the Byzantine Rite.' J. Lebon: 'Lietzmann Das Leben des hl. Simeon Stylites.' L. Bril: 'Frehlrol L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands.' P. Fournier: 'Frehlbiel The Interdict (1198-1216)'; 'Valois Le Pape et le Concile (1188-50)' [12 pp.]. A. Bayot: 'Jorga Istoria bisericii românești.' G. Villat: 'Asal Die Wahl Johannis XXII.' A. Fierens: 'Jacob Studien über Papst Benedikt XII (1334-42).' L. Guilloreau: 'Hingeston-Randolph Register of Edmund Lacy, Bishop of Exeter (1420-55), I.' P. Richard: 'Pastor Geschichte der Päpste, V (1534-49)' [6 pp.]. A. de Meester: 'Holtzmann Kaiser Maximilian II (1527-64).' M. Dubruel: 'Boehmer Les Jésuites' (14 pp.). J. Naulaerts: 'De la Servière La Théologie de Bellarmin.' R. de Smedt: 'Eisler Das Veto der katholischen Staaten bei der Papstwahl.'
- Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (N.S. Vol. I. No. 6. November-December 1910. Paris: É. Nourry). E. C. Babut: 'S. Martin de Tours.' A. Lagarde: 'Le Manuel du Confesseur au XI^e siècle.' Of Burchard of Worms. A. Loisy: 'Le sacrifice humain dans l'antiquité Israélite,' II. A. Loisy: 'Harnack Dogmengeschichte' (4th edit.); 'Goguel L'Eucharistie, des origines à Justin Martyr'; 'Fribelius Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus' ('très remarquable'); 'Weiss Christus. Die Anfänge des Dogmas.' R. Lawson: 'Gummey Desecration of the Eucharist'; 'Wieland Mensa u. Confessio.'
- Revue des Questions Historiques* (Vol. LXXXVIII. No. 176. October 1910. Paris: 5, rue Saint-Simon). J. W. Vidal: 'Un ascète de sang royal Philippe de Majorque.' H. de Landosle: 'L'enlèvement du grand duc Philippe de Vendôme,' IV. H. Rubat du Mérac: 'L'abbaye de Conques.' P. Bliard: 'Un groupe de régicides après les Cent-Jours.' F. Frehlrol: 'Garstang The Land of the Hittites'; 'Hobhouse The Church and the World'; 'Plummer Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae'; 'Snead-Cox The Life of Cardinal Vaughan.' J. Guiraud: 'Kirsch u. Luksch Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche'; 'Lenôtre Paris révolutionnaire.' A. Isnard: 'Charlétty Documents inédits sur l'histoire de la Révolution française.' J. Denais: 'Denia Histoire de la guerre de la Vendée.' 'De Lanzac de Laborie Paris sous Napoléon, VI.' G. Desdevizes du Dezert: 'Bardoux Les Chouettes d'outre-Manche' ('d'une captivante lecture'). A. Vogt: 'Martin La situation du catholicisme à Genève (1815-1907).' A. du Bourg: 'Rabory Histoire de Marmoutier.' M. Prinnet: 'Chailan L'ordre des Moines dans la ville d'Arles.'
- Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (Vol. XXXIV. No. 4. 1910. Innsbruck: Pustet). J. Hontheim: 'Die Gottesnamen in der Genesis.' J. Rett: 'Die Gewalt der Regularbeichtväter über Gelübde.' H. Bruders: 'Mt. 16, 19; 18, 18 und 20, 22. 23 in frühchristlicher Auslegung.' Tertullian. F. Lauchert: 'Buschbell Reformation u. Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des XVII. Jahrhunderts.' L. Schmitt: 'Hughes History of the Society of Jesus in N. America, I. 2.' A. Kröss: 'Schnürer Die Bekehrung der Deutschen zum Christentum. Bonifatius.' J. Linder: 'Kortleitner De Hebraeorum ante exilium Babylonium Monotheismo.' H. Bruders: 'Gregory Textkritik des N.T.' M. Flunk: 'Joüon Le Cantique des Cantiques.' A. Kröss: 'Die Unterwerfung des utraquistischen Administrators Heinrich Dworsky (Curius) von Helfenberg unter dem

katholischen Erzbischof Anton Brus (1572).' P. Sinthern: (1) 'Archaeologica Romana'; (2) 'Zur Chronologie der Fresken von S. Maria Antiqua' (3) 'Zum Liber Pontificalis des Agnellus.' H. Wiesmann: 'Bemerkung zum 1. Buche Samuels 15, 10-12; 13, 3-7^a.' J. Linder: 'Der bun Rock Josephs.'

Theologisch Tijdschrift (N.S. Vol. III. No. 6. 1910. Leiden: S. van Doesburgh). R. Vorenkamp: 'Op de Grenzen van Godsdiën en Natuurwetenschap.' M. Beversluis: 'Heeft "het Spiritisme" beteekenis voor de Theologie of niet?' M. Wolff: 'Twee nieuwe Hypothesen oder den Tijd van het Onstaan der Synagoge.' J. de Zwaan: 'Exegese en Syntaxis Temporum.' K. Lake: 'The Debt of the Clergy and Theologians to William James.' G. A. v. d. Bergh van Eysinga: 'De Indische Theosophie en hare Beteekenis voor ons.' F. W. Grosheide: 'Rom. 4, 19 en 14, 1.' A. van Veldhuizen: (1) 'Luk. 8, 47'; (2) 'F. 1, 21.'

The Church Missionary Intelligence (Vol. LXI. Nos. 738-40. October-December 1910. C.M.S.). D. D. Main: 'Medical Education in China.' W. St. C. Tisdall: 'Some Misconceptions concerning Islam.' C. C. Rice: 'The Women of Persia.' Bishop Montgomery: *Service Abroad*. November. H. G. Harding: 'Richter *History of Missions in the Near East*.' Jessup: *Fifty-three Years in Syria*. Right Rev. E. G. Ingham: 'The Relation of Episcopal to Non-Episcopal Bodies in the Mission Field.' Church Congress Paper, 1910. 'Gairdner *Edinburgh*, 1910.' Arrbruster: *Initia Amharica*, II. 'Forrest *India's Hurt and other Addresses*. December. D. H. D. Wilkinson: 'Apostolic Success. Its Open Secret.' Right Rev. G. H. Lander (Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong): 'A Thirty Years' Retrospect.' Diocesan Conference Address, Sept. 14, 1910. G. Morrison: 'The Awakening of China.' 'Alldridge *A Transform. Colony*' (Sierra Leone).

The East and the West (Vol. VIII. No. 32. October 1910. S.P.G.). Right Rev. C. H. Brent (Bishop of the Philippine Islands): 'The World Missionary Conference. An Interpretation.' R. Speer: 'The Edinburgh Missionary Conference.' 'An Unspiritual Missionary': '"Unspiritual Work" in the Mission Field.' J. L. Latham: 'Women's Education in India.' K. S. Rao: 'Christian Missions and Social Reform in India.' G. Westcott (Bishop-designate of Lucknow): 'The Proposed College Study in N. India.' L. Johnston: 'Modern Missionary Methods. A Question.' 'A Scene in a Missionary Bazaar.' J. Johnston: 'Missionary Contributions to Science and Exploration.' A. Wells: 'The Development of Christianity.' S. S. Thomas: 'Co-operation for the Promotion of Unity. A History.' Bishop of Madras, A. Mayhew and F. F. Brown: 'The Influence of the Conversion of Indian Out-castes on Brahmans and Sudras.' M. Faithfull-Davies: 'Cruciform Churches in the East.' 'Hobhouse *The Church and the World*.' 'Congreve *Christian Progress*.' 'Bishop of Bombay *Reunion in Western India*.'

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be noticed in Articles or Short Notices as space permits.

BIBLICAL AND KINDRED STUDIES.

ABBOTT, E. A.—'The Son of Man,' or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus. 'Diatessarica,' Part VIII. Pp. lii + 874. (Cambridge University Press.) 16s. 6d. net.

BLAGDEN, C. M.—*The Epistles of Peter, John and Jude*. 'The Revised Version, edited for the Use of Schools.' Pp. viii + 96. (Cambridge University Press.) 1s. 6d. net.

HILL, J. H.—*The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels, being the 'Diatessaron' of Tatian* [circ. A.D. 160]. Literally translated from the Arabic Version and containing the Four Gospels woven into one story. With an Introduction and Notes. Second edition abridged. Pp. xvi + 224. (T. and T. Clark.) 3s. net. With a very useful marginal indication of sources.

KNOWLING, R. J.—*Messianic Interpretation and other Studies*. Pp. 182. (S.P.C.K.) 3s.

NAVILLE, E.—*The Discovery of the Book of the Law under King Josiah: An Egyptian Interpretation of the Biblical Account*. Translated by M. L. McCURE. With an Introduction by A. H. SAYCE. Pp. xii + 46. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

OESTERLEY, W. O. E.—*The Psalms in the Jewish Church*. Pp. x + 267. (Skeffington.) 3s. 6d. net.

PETRIE, W. M. FLINDERS.—*Egypt and Israel*. Pp. 150. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. 6d.

WIENER, H. M.—*The Origin of the Pentateuch*. Pp. vi + 150. (Elliot Stock.) 1s. 6d. net.

PHILOSOPHY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

COKE, H. J.—*The Domain of Belief*. Pp. x + 312. (Macmillan.) 7s. 6d. net.

HEGEL, G. W. F.—*The Phenomenology of Mind*. Translated by J. B. BAILLIE. 'Library of Philosophy.' Two volumes. Pp. xlv + 428, viii + 429-824. (Swan Sonnenschein.) 21s. net.

HUNT, C.—*The Deathless Soul: Commonsense Reasons for Believing in Existence after Death*. With many passages on Immortality from Scientists, Philosophers, and Poets, collected by O.W. Pp. xiv + 102. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.

JACKS, L. P.—*The Alchemy of Thought*. Pp. x + 350. (Williams and Norgate.) 10s. 6d. net.

JEVONS, F. B.—*The Idea of God in Early Religions*. 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' Pp. x + 170. (Cambridge University Press.) 1s. net.

KEARY, C. F.—*The Pursuit of Reason*. Pp. viii + 456. (Cambridge University Press.) 9s. net.

LAGRANGE, M. J.—*Notes on the 'Orpheus' of M. Salomon Reinach*. Translated by C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. Pp. 52. (Oxford: Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall.) 1s. net.

LODGE, SIR O.—*Reason and Belief*. Pp. xiv + 212. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net.

PALMER, W. SCOTT.—*The Diary of a Modernist*. Pp. viii + 320. (Arnold.) 5s. net.

RICHARD, T.—*The New Testament of Higher Buddhism*. Pp. viii + 276. (T. and T. Clark.) 6s. net.

SMYTH, J. P.—*The Gospel of the Hereafter*. Pp. viii + 230. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 2s. 6d. net. By the Rector of St. George's, Montreal.

TIRARD, H. M.—*The Book of the Dead*. With an Introduction by E. NAVILLE. Pp. 170. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d. See Short Notices.

BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

CREE, E. D.—*Pre-Christian Teaching*. Pp. xiv + 84. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

LEBRETON, J.—*Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*. 'Bibliothèque de Théologie historique.' Pp. xxvi + 570. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 8 fr.

ORR, J.—*Sin as a Problem of To-day*. Pp. viii + 324. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

STONE, D.—*The Notes of the Church*. 'English Churchman's Library.' Pp. viii + 124. (Mowbray.) 1s. net. Four lectures in St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 1909.

SWETE, H. B.—*The Ascended Christ: a Study in the Earliest Christian Teaching*. Pp. xvi + 168. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

WARMAN, F. S. G.—*New Testament Theology*. 'Anglican Church Handbooks.' Pp. 128. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

APOLOGETICS.

ARCHER-SHEPHERD, E. H.—*The Nature and Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ*. Pp. viii + 100. (Rivington.) 2s. 6d. net.

HITCHCOCK, F. R. M.—*Christ and His Critics: Studies in the Person and Problems of Jesus*. With Introduction by the DEAN OF ST. PATRICK'S. Pp. xii + 180. (Robert Scott.) 2s. 6d. net.

THORBURN, T. J.—*The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism: A 'Critique' mainly of Professor Schmiedel's Article 'Resurrection Narratives' in the 'Encyclopaedia Biblica'*. Pp. xx + 218. (Kegan Paul.) 6s. net. See Short Notices.

ECCLIASTICAL HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

BOND, F.—*Wood Carvings in English Churches*. I. *Stalls and Tabernacle Work*. II. *Bishop's Thrones and Chancel Chairs*. Pp. xvi + 138. (Frowde.) 6s. net. Illustrated by 124 Photographs and Drawings.

BROWN, J.—*The English Puritans*. 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' Pp. viii + 160. (Cambridge University Press.) 1s. net. See Short Notices.

BUMPUS, J. S.—*A Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Terms, being a History and Explanation of certain Terms used in Architecture, Ecclesiology, Liturgy, Music, Ritual, Cathedral Constitution, etc.* Pp. iv + 324. (T. Werner Laurie.) 21s. net.

BUMPUS, T. F.—*The Cathedrals of Northern France*. Pp. x + 396. (T. Werner Laurie.) 6s. net.

CLAYTON, H. J.—*Church Defence*. 'Handbooks for the Clergy' series. Pp. viii + 158. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

COOPER, J.—*The Present Outlook from a Scottish Watch-Tower*. Being an Introductory Lecture to the Senior Church History Class at the University of Glasgow, 17 October 1910. Pp. 32. (Glasgow: Maclehose.)

COX, J. C.—*County Churches, Norfolk*. Two Volumes. I. Northern Division. II. Southern Division. Pp. xvi + 260, xii + 248. (G. Allen.) 3s. each net. See Short Notices.

DITCHFIELD, P. H.—*Symbolism of the Saints*. 'Arts of the Church' series. Pp. xiv + 200. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net. With 40 Illustrations.

DRYDEN, A. (edited by).—*Memorials of Old Leicestershire*. Pp. xii + 17 []. (George Allen.) 15s. net. With many Illustrations.

FRERE, W. H. (edited by).—*Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. 'Alcuin Club Collections,' xiv. Three Volumes. Pp. xvi + 386, viii + 426, viii + 386. (Longmans.) 4s. net.

GRANGER, M. E. [Gray, Melville].—*The Black Letter Saints of the Prayer Book*. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR. Pp. xvi + 168. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.) 2s. 6d. net.

JEFFERSON, C. E.—*The Building of the Church*. 'Lyman Beecher Lectures' at Yale, 1910. Pp. viii + 306. (Macmillan Co.) 5s. net. By the Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City.

LACEY, T. A.—*A Roman Diary and other Documents relating to the Papal Inquiry into English Ordinations MDCCCXCVI*. Pp. xvi + 420. (Longmans.) 12s. net.

LEIGHTON, H. R.—*Memorials of Old Durham*. Pp. xii + 264. (G. Allen.) 15s. net. See Short Notices.

MORRIS, J. E.—*County Churches, Surrey*. Pp. x + 200. (George Allen.) 2s. 6d. net. Illustrated. See Short Notices.

OYLER, T. H.—*The Parish Churches of the Diocese of Canterbury*. With Descriptive Notes. Sketch of Canterbury Cathedral by A. FAIRBAIRNS. Pp. 190. (Hunter and Longhurst.) 10s. 6d. net.

PFLEIDERER, O.—*Primitive Christianity: its Writings and Teachings in their Historical Connections*. Volume III. 'Theological Translation Library,' Vol. XXVII. Pp. vi + 476. (Williams and Norgate.) 10s. 6d. net.

RAMSAY, SIR W. M.—*Pictures of the Apostolic Church: its Life and Teaching*. Pp. xvi + 368. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

SPENCE-JONES, VERY REV. H. D. M. (Dean of Gloucester).—*The Early Christians in Rome*. Pp. xxxii + 410. (Methuen.) 12s. 6d.

STONE, D.—*Episcopacy and Valid Orders in the Primitive Church: a Statement of Evidence*. 'Pusey House Occasional Papers,' No. 6. Pp. 60. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

SYMPSON, E. M. (edited by).—*Memorials of Old Lincolnshire*. Pp. xvi + 348. (Allen.) 15s. net.

SYRETT, N.—*The Story of Saint Catherine of Siena*. Pp. x + 110. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. With twelve Illustrations in half-tone and Frontispiece in colours.

TUCKER, T. G.—*Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul*. Pp. xx + 454. (Macmillan.) 12s. 6d. net.

WACE, VERY REV. H. (Dean of Canterbury).—*Principles of the Reformation, Practical and Historical*. Pp. x + 252. (Nisbet.) 5s. net.

An Excerpt from 'Reliquiae Baxterianae' or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times; also an Essay by Sir James Stephen on Richard Baxter. Edited with Preface, Notes, and Appendices by FRANCIS JOHN, BISHOP OF CHESTER. With two Portraits. Pp. xiv + 170. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

MODERN HISTORY.

BRYCE, J.—*The American Commonwealth*. In two Volumes. Vol. I. *The National Government—The State Government*. Vol. II. *The Party System—Public Opinion—Illustrations and Reflections—Social Institutions*. New edition, completely revised throughout, with additional chapters. Pp. xvi + 742, viii + 962. (Macmillan.) 21s. net.

FORBES MITCHELL, W.—*Reminiscences of the Great Mutiny, 1857-59, including the Relief, Siege, and Capture of Lucknow, and the Campaigns in Rohilund and Oude*. Pp. xii + 296. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

HODGSON, F.—*Venice in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: a Sketch of Venetian History from the Conquest of Constantinople to the Accession of Michele Steno*. A.D. 1204-1400. Pp. xvi + 684. (G. Allen.) 10s. 6d. net.

TREVELYAN, SIR G., BART.—*Cawnpore*. Pp. viii + 280. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

VENN, J.—*Grace Book Δ, containing the Records of the University of Cambridge for the Years 1542-1589*. Pp. xxviii + 580. (Cambridge University Press.) 21s. net.

YOUNGHUSBAND, G. J. and SIR F.—*The Relief of Chitral*. Pp. viii + 232. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. With Map and Illustrations.

The Cambridge Modern History. Volume XII. *The Latest Age*. Pp. xxxiv + 1034. (Cambridge University Press.) 16s. net.

PRACTICAL AND DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

ASLING, D.—*The Blessed Angels: a Book for Children*. Pp. vi + 36. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.

BELL, N.—*Legends of our Lord and the Holy Family*. Pp. xii + 302. (Kegan Paul.) 6s. net. With 32 Illustrations.

CAMERON, A. M.—*Saint Paul in Daily Life*. Extracts from the Epistles of St. Paul in the setting of the Acts of the Apostles taken chronologically and arranged for Daily Reading. Pp. 216. (Allenson.) 1s. 6d. net.

CLOW, W. M.—*The Secret of the Lord*. Pp. xii + 354. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

CUNNINGHAM, VEN. W. (Archdeacon of Ely).—*Christianity and Social Questions*. Pp. xii + 232. (Duckworth.) 2s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

DRAKE, F. W.—*The Way of Fellowship*. Pp. x + 148. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net.

FIGGIS, J. N.—*Religion and English Society*. Two Addresses delivered at a Conference held in London, November 9 and 10, 1910. Pp. 48. (Longmans.) 1s.

FOWLER, M.—*The Morality of Social Pleasures*. Pp. x + 150. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

G., C. C.—*Bible Readings*. A Series of Short Readings for every day of the Christian Year (during three years) according to the seasons of the Church. Published with the approval of the Bishop of London. (S.P.C.K.) 2s.

HARDING, E. E. (the late).—*The Mirror of Missioners, or Pastoral Thoughts from the Book of Joshua*. With Forewords by the BISHOPS OF LICHFIELD and BIRMINGHAM and a Memoir. Pp. xii + 100. (Mowbray.) 2s. net. By the late Principal of Lichfield Theological College.

HASTINGS, J.—*The Great Texts of the Bible. Isaiah. St. Mark*. Pp. viii + 504, x + 516. (T. and T. Clark.) 10s. each net.

HENDERSON, C. R.—*Social Duties from the Christian Point of View. A Textbook for the Study of Social Problems*. 'Constructive Bible Studies,' Advanced and Supplementary Series. Pp. xiv + 332. (Chicago University Press. Cambridge University Press.) 5s. net. See Short Notices.

KELMAN, J.—*Ephemeræ Eternitatis: a Book of Short Studies in Life Here and Hereafter, arranged for the Sundays of the Christian Year*. Pp. xvi + 340. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s. net.

LOWRY, S. C.—*Hymns and Spiritual Songs*. Pp. 94. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net.

[MERLO, JACQUES] HORST.—*Paradise for the Christian Soul enriched with Choicest Delights of Varied Piety*. Adapted to the use of the English Church by E. B. PUSEY. New edition. Pp. xlii + 648. (Oxford: Parker.) 3s. net.

NICOLL, SIR W. R.—*The Round of the Clock: 'The Story of our Lives from Year to Year.'* Pp. xxiv + 324. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

PERCEVAL, M.—*The Prophets, how should we read them?* Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

PLATTS, C.—*Pioneers of our Faith*. Pp. xvi + 418. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d. net. With 20 Illustrations.

RANDOLPH, B. W. (edited by).—*Spiritual Letters of Edward King, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln*. Pp. xiv + 184. (Mowbray.) 2s. net.

———.—*The Earthly Life of our Lord*. Pp. iv + 52. (Mowbray.) 1s. net. Illustrated. The text appeared without illustrations in the 'Churchman's Penny Library,' No. 27.

ROSSETTI, CHRISTINA.—*Angels*. Pp. 66. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

———.—*Christ our All*. Pp. 68. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

———.—*Church Seasons in Verse*. Pp. 62. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

SCOTT, F. N.—*Selections from the Old Testament*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. 'Pocket Classics' series. Pp. xxviii + 336. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

TERENCE, V.—*Behind the Blinds*. Pp. 164. (Allenson.) 2s. 6d. net

WALKER, W.—*Great Men of the Christian Church*. 'Constructive Bible Studies,' Advanced and Supplementary Series. Pp. x + 378. (Chicago University Press. Cambridge University Press.) 5s. net.

WHISH, E.—*Until Shiloh Come*. With an Introduction by J. BRETT. Pp. viii + 48. (Longmans.) 1s. 6d. net.

WIGRAM, E.—*Theology for Parents*. Pp. vi + 186. (Mowbray.) Abridged edition of *Firm Foundations*.

A Book for the King's Watchman, being Stray Thoughts for Invalids. With an Introduction by B. W. RANDOLPH. Pp. xii + 226. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net. A beautiful little book by an invalid.

Church Life and Discipline in the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. 'London Diocesan Church Reading Union, Study Circle Guides,' No. 2. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K.) 2d.

Day by Day we worship Thee: Readings and Prayers from Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer. For Households, Hospitals and Institutions. Pp. xiv + 228. (Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d. net. An admirably printed selection of Short Readings and Collects.

Devotions for Holy Communion. Compiled from the Roman Missal and Breviary, the Paradisus Animae, the Following of Christ, the Hymns of the Church and the Writings of the Saints. With a Preface by A. GOODIER, S.J. Pp. xxxii + 246. (Burns and Oates.) 3s. 6d. net.

Salvation by Grace considered in connection with the Study of the Epistle to the Romans. 'London Diocesan Church Reading Union, Study Circle Guides,' No. 1. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K.) 2d.

The Expositor's Dictionary of Texts. Containing Outlines, Expositions, and Illustrations of Bible Texts, with full References to the Best Homiletic Literature. Edited by Sir W. R. NICOLL and J. T. STODDART with the Co-operation of J. MOFFATT. 'Genesis to St. Mark.' Pp. vi + 1060. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 25s. net.

The Gospel according to St. Luke. Pp. 102. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net. The text of R.V. is taken, but printed as a story divided into sections without verse marks and with 25 full-page Illustrations from famous pictures.

The Gospel Story. Pp. 80. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. With 16 Coloured Pictures and other Illustrations.

The Imitation of Christ by Thomas a Kempis. Edited with Introduction and Notes by BROTHER LEO, F.S.C. 'Pocket Classics' series. Pp. lx + 354. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

The Nativity in Song. Pp. 68. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

The Old Testament Story. Pp. 80. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. With 16 Coloured Pictures and other Illustrations.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

ALEXANDER, S. A.—*Progressive Revelation*. Lectures to Clergy given in St. Asaph Cathedral, June 1910. Pp. vi + 80. (Murray.) 2s. 6d. net.

COOKE, G. A.—*The Progress of Revelation: Sermons chiefly on the Old Testament*. Pp. xii + 202. (T. and T. Clark.) 4s. 6d. net.

DAVIES, J. L. P.—*The Purpose of God: Ten Sermons for the Time, with an Appendix on Life under Insoluble Problems*. Pp. viii + 140. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

DIX, MORGAN (the late).—*Instructions on the Religious Life given to the Sisters of Saint Mary, New York*. With Preface by the BISHOP OF EDINBURGH. Pp. xx + 314. (Mowbray.) 5s. net.

DUDDEN, F. H.—*Christ and Christ's Religion*. Sermons. 'The Scholar as Preacher,' Second Series. Pp. x + 256. (T. and T. Clark.) 4s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

HOLMES, E. E.—*The Church, her Books and her Sacraments.* A Course of Instructions given at All Saints, Margaret Street, in Lent 1910. Pp. xii + 168. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net.

HYAMSON, M.—*The Oral Law and Other Sermons.* Pp. x + 188. (David Nutt.) 3s. 6d. net. By the Dayan of the United Synagogue.

KING, RIGHT REV. E. (late Bishop of Lincoln).—*The Love and Wisdom of God.* Being a Collection of Sermons. Pp. xiv + 350. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

MACGREGOR, W. M.—*Some of God's Ministries.* 'The Scholar as Preacher,' Second Series. Pp. x + 298. (T. and T. Clark.) 4s. 6d. net.

MILLARD, F. L. H.—*The Last Words: an Indication of the Glory of the Cross.* With Preface by the BISHOP OF CHICHESTER. Pp. 58. (Elliot Stock.) 1s. 6d. net.

MUSPRATT, W.—*The Work and Power of the Holy Spirit.* Pp. vi + 118. (Elliot Stock.) 2s. net. Sermons by the Chaplain of Coonoor, India.

NICOLL, SIR W. R.—*Sunday Evening, Fifty-two Short Sermons for Home Reading.* Pp. x + 416. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s. net.

SMITH, D.—*Man's Need of God and other Sermons preached at Blairgowrie.* Pp. xvi + 288. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. See Short Notices.

WILSON, J. M.—*Studies in the Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels.* Being Two Courses of Sermons preached in Worcester Cathedral, on the Sunday Mornings in Lent, and in July 1910. Pp. viii + 140. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

MISSIONS.

GOWEN, H. H.—*Pioneer Church Work in British Columbia, being a Memoir of the Episcopate of Acton Windeyer Sillitoe, D.D., D.C.L., first Bishop of New Westminster.* Pp. xxviii + 232. (Mowbray.) 3s. 6d. net.

INGHAM, RIGHT REV. E. H.—*From Japan to Jerusalem.* Pp. viii + 232. (C.M.S.) 2s. 6d.

LUCAS, B.—*Christ for India, being a Presentation of the Christian Message to the Religious Thought of India.* Pp. xii + 448. (Macmillan.) 4s. 6d. net.

LITURGICA.

BISHOP, W. C.—*Rubrical Revision: an Appeal to Principle.* Pp. 32. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

COBB, C. S.—*The Rationale of Ceremonial, 1540-1543.* With Notes and Appendices and an Essay on the Regulation of Ceremonial during the reign of King Henry VIII. With four Facsimiles of Handwriting. 'Alcuin Club Collections,' xviii. Pp. lxxviii + 80. (Longmans.) 10s.

DOWDEN, RIGHT REV. JOHN (late Bishop of Edinburgh).—*The Church Year and Kalendar.* 'Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study.' Pp. xxvi + 160. (Cambridge University Press.) 4s. net. See Short Notices.

WILSON, H. A. (edited by).—*The Pontifical of Magdalen College.* With an Appendix of Extracts from other English MSS. of the Twelfth Century. 'Henry Bradshaw Society' Publications, Vol. XXXIX. Pp. xxxii + 314. (London: Printed for the Society by Harrison and Sons.)

WOOLLEY, R. M.—*The Liturgy of the Primitive Church.* Pp. viii + 182. (Cambridge University Press.) 5s. net.

EDUCATION.

BURTON, E. DE W. and MATHEWS, S.—*Principles and Ideals for the Sunday School: an Essay in Religious Pedagogy*. Pp. viii + 208. (Chicago University Press. Cambridge University Press.) 4s. net. By two Professors in the University of Chicago.

DAWSON, G. E.—*The Child and His Religion*. Pp. x + 124. (Chicago University Press. Cambridge University Press.) 3s. net. By the Professor of Psychology, Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy.

MOORE, H. K.—*The Training of Infants with Special Reference to the Sunday School*. Pp. xii + 104. (Longmans.) 2s. By the Principal of the Church of Ireland Training College.

SCIENCE.

DONCASTER, C.—*Heredity in the Light of Recent Research*. 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' Pp. x + 140. (Cambridge University Press.) 1s. net.

HORSLEY, SIR V., and STURGE, M. D.—*Alcohol and the Human Body: an Introduction to the Study of the Subject and a Contribution to National Health*. With a chapter by A. NEWSHOLME. Pp. xxvi + 290. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

JUDD, J. W.—*The Coming of Evolution: the Story of a Great Revolution in Science*. 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' Pp. vi + 172. (Cambridge University Press.) 1s. net.

MACDONALD, G.—*The Child's Inheritance: its Scientific and Imaginative Meaning*. Pp. xiv + 340. (Smith, Elder.) 12s. 6d. net.

TOPOGRAPHY AND TRAVEL.

BROWN, G.—*Melanesians and Polynesians: their Life and Histories described and compared*. Pp. xvi + 452. (Macmillan.) 12s. net. Illustrated.

CARR, A.—*North Italian Folk: Sketches of Town and Country Life*. Pp. xii + 282. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. By Mrs. Comyns Carr, with Illustrations by Randolph Caldecott.

CONYBEARE, E.—*Highways and Byways in Cambridge and Ely*. Pp. xx + 440. (Macmillan.) 6s. Illustrated by F. L. Griggs.

DENNETT, R. E.—*Nigerian Studies, or the Religious and Political System of the Yoruba*. Pp. xvi + 236. (Macmillan.) 8s. 6d. With Illustrations and Map.

HEDIN, SVEN.—*Överland to India*. Two Volumes. Pp. xx + 416, xiv + 342. (Macmillan.) 30s. net. With 308 Illustrations from Photographs, Water-colour Sketches and Drawings by the Author, and two Maps.

HICHENS, R.—*The Holy Land*. Illustrated by J. GUÉRIN and with Photographs. Pp. x + 302. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 25s. net.

HISSEY, J. J.—*The Charm of the Road: England and Wales*. Pp. xviii + 422. (Macmillan.) 10s. net. With 28 full-page Illustrations and a Map.

KINGSLEY, C.—*At Last. A Christmas in the West Indies*. Pp. x + 334. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. Illustrated.

MCCLINTOCK, W.—*The Old North Trail, or, Life Legends and Religion of the Blackfeet Indians*. Pp. xxvi + 540. (Macmillan.) 15s. net.

SYKES, P. M.—*The Glory of the Shia World: the Tale of a Pilgrimage*. Translated and edited from a Persian Manuscript. Assisted by Khan Bahadur AHMAD DIN KHAN. Pp. xiv + 280. (Macmillan.) 10s. net. With many Illustrations in the Text and four Coloured Reproductions from Persian Paintings.

BIOGRAPHY.

BARTON, C. E. (the late).—*John Barton. A Memoir.* Pp. xvi + 168. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d. net. With a Preface by the Bishop of Durham.

DODS, M.—*Early Letters of Marcus Dods, D.D. (late Principal of New College, Edinburgh), (1850-1864).* Selected and edited by his son. Pp. viii + 390. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

ROBINS, M. W.—*Mother Cecile of Grahamstown, South Africa: a Record of a Great Educational Work.* Pp. 48. (Wells Gardner.) 2d.

SHERLOCK, F.—*Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.* Pp. 46. (Wells Gardner.) 2d.

NOVELS AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

ALLEN, J. LANE.—*The Doctor's Christmas Eve.* Pp. xii + 336. (Macmillan.) 6s.

CHILD, R. W.—*Jim Hands.* Pp. viii + 358. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s.

DENT, M. V.—*Innocence and Death.* Pp. xiv + 184. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net. A very pathetic little Anthology of verse and prose extracts on the Death of Little Children.

FORBES, ARCHIBALD.—*Barracks, Bivouacs and Battles.* Pp. vi + 328. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

HODGSON, G. E.—*The Form of Perfect Living and other Prose Treatises* by Richard Rolle of Hampole, A.D. 1300-1349. Rendered into Modern English. Pp. xxxvi + 192. (London: T. Baker.) 3s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

JAMES, G.—*Green Willow and other Japanese Fairy Tales.* Pp. viii + 282. (Macmillan.) 15s. net. With 40 Illustrations in Colour by Warwick Goble, most beautifully reproduced.

KIPLING, R.—*Rewards and Fairies.* Pp. xii + 338. (Macmillan.) 6s. With Illustrations by Frank Craig.

LOCKYER, SIR N., and LOCKYER, W. L.—*Tennyson as a Student and Poet of Nature.* With an Introduction and Notes. Pp. xii + 220. (Macmillan.) 4s. 6d. net.

MITFORD, M. R.—*Our Village.* With an Introduction by A. T. RITCHIE. Pp. lx + 256. (Macmillan.) 10s. 6d. net. Beautifully illustrated with 100 Drawings by Hugh Thomson and sixteen coloured Plates from Drawings by Alfred Rawlings.

NEVILL, R. (edited by).—*Leaves from the Note-Books of Lady Dorothy Nevill.* Pp. xii + 308. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

REDESDALE, LORD.—*Tales of Old Japan.* With Illustrations drawn and cut on wood by Japanese Artists. Pp. xii + 302. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

REYNOLDS, S.—*A Long Shore where Man and the Sea face one another.* Pp. xviii + 326. (Macmillan.) 6s. Illustrated by M. Mackay.

RICKARDS, M. S. C.—*Garnered Beauty.* Pp. x + 132. (Clifton and London: J. Baker and Son.)

SCOTT, F. G.—*Poems.* Pp. xii + 298. (Constable.) 5s. net. See Short Notices.

SHEPPARD, E.—*Flora's Choice.* Pp. viii + 296. (London: The Angelus Co.) 6s.

SMITH, GOLDWIN (the late).—*Reminiscences.* Edited by A. HAULTAIN. Pp. xvi + 478. (Macmillan.) 10s. net. Illustrated.

SMITH, HORACE.—*Interludes (Fifth Series), being Three Essays and Some Verses.* Pp. viii + 90. (Macmillan.) 5s. A pleasant little book.

SNEYD-KYNNERSLEY, E. M.—*H. M. I. Passages in the Life of one of H.M. Inspectors of Schools.* Pp. viii + 286. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. One of the most entertaining volumes of its kind ever written.

WEALE, B. L. P.—*The Conflict of Colour, being a Detailed Examination of Racial Problems throughout the World, with Special Reference to the English-speaking Peoples.* Pp. x + 340. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

WHITE, RIGHT REV. G. (Bishop of Carpentaria).—*The World's Tragedy and Other Poems.* Pp. iv + 40. (Thursday Island, Australia: Diocesan Book Department. London, 12 High Street, Hampstead, N.W.: Hewetson and Son.) 2s. See Short Notices.

WRIGHT, M. O.—*Princess Flower Hat: a Comedy from the Perplexity Book of Barbara the Commuter's Wife.* Pp. vi + 284. (Macmillan.) 6s.

CHILDREN'S GIFT-BOOKS, ETC.

BARNES, I. H.—*A Peace Scout.* Pp. 192. (C.M.S.) 1s. 6d. Illustrated by J. B. Greene.

BEHM, B.—*A History of Some French Kings.* Pp. viii + 350. (Macmillan.) 5s. net. For children in the form of stories.

CARROLL, L.—*The Hunting of the Snark: an Agony in Eight Fits.* Pp. xiv + 84. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. With Illustrations by Henry Holliday.

CRAKE, A. D.—*The Last Abbot of Glastonbury: a Tale of the Dissolution of the Monasteries.* Pp. xvi + 250. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net. With nine Illustrations by G. E. Kruger.

ELIAS, E. L.—*Stories from Bunyan.* 'The Pilgrim's Progress' retold for Children. Pp. viii + 144. (Methuen.) 1s. 6d.

MAJOR, C.—*The Little King: a Story of the Childhood of Louis XIV, King of France.* Pp. x + 250. (Macmillan.) 6s.

MOLESWORTH, [M. L.]—*The Story of a Year.* Pp. x + 232. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. Illustrated by G. D. Hammond.

NESBIT, E.—*The Magic City.* Pp. xiv + 334. (Macmillan.) 6s. Illustrated by H. R. Millar.

Three Tales of Hans Andersen. With 22 Illustrations by LINLEY SAMBOURNE. Pp. viii + 80. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

ADDAMS, J.—*Twenty Years at Hull-House, with Autobiographical Notes.* Pp. xviii + 462. (The Macmillan Co.) 10s. 6d. net.

BENSON, R. H.—*Non-Catholic Denominations.* 'Westminster Library.' Pp. xvi + 218. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

CANTON, W.—*A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* Volumes III-V. Pp. xii + 488, xii + 480, xii + 456. (Murray.) 30s. net. With Portraits and Illustrations.

CHIROL, V.—*Indian Unrest.* Pp. xvi + 372. (Macmillan.) 5s. net. A Reprint, revised and enlarged, from 'The Times,' with an Introduction by Sir Alfred Lyall.

DEARMER, M.—*The Playmate: a Christmas Mystery.* Pp. 32. (Mowbray.) 1s. net. With 3 Characters and with 4 Illustrations by Helen Stratton.

DEARMER, P.—*The Church and Social Questions.* 'Churchman's Penny Library,' No. 32. Pp. 40. (Mowbray.) 1d.

EVERITT, H.—*The Christian Marriage Law.* 'Churchman's Penny Library,' No. 31. (Mowbray.) 1d.

JOHNSON, T. (edited by).—*The Clergyman's Ready Reference Diary and Kalendar for 1911.* For the special use of the Clergy and their Parish Workers. Pp. viii + 370. (G. Allen.)

NICHOLSON, J. S.—*A Project of Empire: a Critical Study of the Economics of Imperialism, with Special Reference to the Ideas of Adam Smith.* Pp. xxvi + 284. (Macmillan.) 7s. 6d. net.

O'BRIEN, W.—*An Olive Branch in Ireland and its History*. Pp. xl + 480. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

RUSSELL, C. E. B.—*Young Gaol Birds*. Pp. xii + 236. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net. See Short Notices.

WARD, M. A.—*Letters to my Neighbours on the Present Election*. Pp. 64. (Smith, Elder.) 2d.

WILKINS, H. J.—*The History of Divorce and Re-marriage for English Churchmen*. Compiled from Holy Scripture, Church Councils, and Authoritative Writers. Pp. viii + 184. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

Golden Sunbeams: A Church Magazine for Children. Vol. XIV. 1910. Pp. iv + 192. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 4d.

Mowbray's Annual. The Churchman's Year Book and Encyclopaedia, A.D. 1911. Pp. 4 + 336. (Mowbray.) 1s. net. A wonderfully compact and useful little book.

The Australian Church Quarterly Review. Vol. I. No. 1. October 1910. Edited by L. B. RADFORD, D.D. (Sydney: D. S. Ford.) 1s. 6d.

The Catholic Almanac, 1911. By the editor of *The Catholic Directory*. Pp. 46. (Burns and Oates.) 1d.

The Catholic Directory, Ecclesiastical Register and Almanac for the Year of our Lord 1911. Pp. xl + 834. (Burns and Oates.) 1s. 6d. The cheapest of all Directories of its kind and one of the best edited.

The Dawn of Day. Volume for 1910. Pp. 4 + 286. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

The East and the West: a Quarterly Review for the Study of Missionary Problems. Vol. VIII. 1910. Pp. iv + 484. (S.P.G.) 4s. 6d. net.

The Englishwoman's Year Book and Directory, 1911, edited by G. E. MITTON. Pp. xxiv + 386. (A. and C. Black.) 2s. 6d. net. A large amount of useful information very compactly summarized.

The Official Report of the Church Congress held at Cambridge on September 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th, 1910. Edited by C. DUNKLEY. Pp. xxxii + 368. (George Allen.) A well-edited and useful Record as usual.

Who's Who, 1911. Pp. xxvi + 2246 (A. and C. Black.) 10s. net. Indispensable.

Worcester Diocesan Conference Report to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester on the subject of the Position of the Holy Communion in the Services of the Lord's Day, presented to him by the Diocesan Conference, June 14th and 15th, 1910, at the Committee appointed for that purpose. With a Preface by the Lord Bishop. Pp. 48. (Mowbray.) 6d.

We have also received from S.P.C.K. a number of Calendars and Diaries of different sizes and prices admirably suited for practical use.

INDEX TO VOL. LXXI.

ASSYRIAN CHURCH, THE [by Rev. Dr. W. A. Wigram], 141 *sqq.*: *Synodicon Orientale* and History of Mshikha-Zca, 142; early history of the Church of Assyria, 143; Christianity under the Sassanid kings, 144; consecration of Shimun bar Sab'ai, 145; Assyrian Church not represented at Council of Nicaea, 146; the Forty years' persecution of Sapor II, 147; Monophysitism dominant in Church of Assyria, 148; dyophysite confession of Bar-Soma, 149; council under Patriarch Ishu-yahb I, 150; substitution of Islam for Zoroastrianism, 151; Nestorian missions in China, 153; spread of Christianity among the Tartars, 154; the Crusades and their effect on the Assyrian Church, 155; Roman embassy to Yahb-Alaha, 156; Timur the Tartar in Mesopotamia, 157; quarrels about succession to patriarchate, 158 *sq.*

BATE, Rev. H. N., *The Healthful Spirit*, 225

BEVAN, Rev. J. O., *Egypt and the Egyptians*, 214

BOOKS RECEIVED, 251, 494

BROWN, Rev. Dr. JOHN, *The English Puritans*, 472

BROWNE, Rt. Rev. Dr. G. F., *Boniface of Crediton and his Companions*, 470

Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews pre-

served in the Public Record Office (ed. by J. M. Rigg), 472

'CHRISTOLOGIES ANCIENT AND MODERN,' DR. SANDAY'S [by Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone], 26 *sqq.*: Dr. Sanday's Preface quoted, 27; discussions on Kenotic theory, 28 *sq.*; Father Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-roads*, 30; Dr. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 31; the eschatological explanation of our Lord's life and teaching, 32 *sq.*; Mr. Durell, *The Self-Revelation of our Lord*, 34; psychological investigations, 35 *sq.*; definition of Christian mysticism, 37; the work of the Holy Ghost is subliminal, 38; human consciousness of our Lord, 39; relation of the Son to the Father, 40; our Lord's consciousness of mission, 41; His consciousness as Messiah and as Son, 42; Dr. Sanday's contribution to the study of psychology, 43 *sq.*; Dr. J. B. Mozley quoted, 45; doctrine the One Person of Christ, 46; Council of Chalcedon, 47 *sq.*; permanent elements in Christian belief, 50; the human and the divine in the mind of Christ, 51; theory of Transubstantiation, 52; J. H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 54

CHURCH AND THE WORLD, THE [by Rev. Dr. E. W. Watson],

160 *sqq.*: early Church history and Erastianism, 161; intensive Christianity of greater value than diffusive, 162; Christ's intention for the Church in relation to the World, 163; Lord Cromer and Sir Harry Johnston, 164; relation of Christian converts to the Church, 165; St. Augustine and the teaching of St. Paul, 166; St. Hilary of Poitiers, 167; the effect of allegory on Christian teaching, 168; influence of Jewish modes of thought, 169; the Apologists and their work, 169 *sq.*; persecution in Africa, 170; policy of Constantine, 171; the barbarian conquest, 173; development of national forms of Christianity, 174; St. Francis, 175; the Papal domination, 176; the Reformation, 177; the Oxford Movement, 178; the Church in the eighteenth century, 179; Bishop Westcott, 180; national Christianity not synonymous with established Christianity, 181 *sq.*; *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, 183; what the effect of Mr. Hobhouse's policy would be, 184; Henry James, *The American Scene*, *ib.*

CHURCH CONGRESS AFTER FIFTY YEARS, THE, 186 *sqq.*: the Liberation Society attacks the establishment, 186; first Church Congress at King's College, 187; Prayer Book revision, *ib.*; Congress helps to preserve the integrity of Anglican Communion, 188; Jubilee Congress at Cambridge, 189; Cambridge teachers in 1861, 190; changes in Cambridge during last half-century, 191; missionary activity, 192; choice of speakers, 193; sermon of Archbishop of York,

194; functions of a Church Congress, 195

CLAYTON, Rev. H. J., *Church Defence*, 475

CONGREVE, Rev. G., *Christian Progress and other Papers and Addresses*, 449

COX, Dr. J. CHARLES, *County Churches, Norfolk*, 477

CUNNINGHAM, Ven. Dr. W., *Christianity and Social Questions*, 463

CURTIS, Rev. Dr. E. L., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, 429

DAY, Rev. Dr. E. HERMITAGE, *Renaissance Architecture in England*, 479

DEGROOT, J. J. M., *The Religion of the Chinese*, 447

DEMOCRACY IN ENGLISH FICTION, 298 *sqq.*: Chaucer and Piers Plowman reflect change in English thought and life, 298; Shakespeare's use of the democracy, 299; *Vicar of Wakefield*, 299 *sq.*; George Crabbe quoted, 300; Walter Scott, 301; George Eliot and Charles Dickens, 302; W. M. Thackeray and Mrs. Gaskell, 303; Anthony Trollope, 304; Arnold Bennett, 305; offensive character sketching, 306; Anthony Hope and Cutcliffe Hyne, 307; snobbishness in modern novels, 308; the Bible and religion treated irreverently, 309; lack of nobility in fiction, 310; Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, 311

Diocesis Cantuariensis: *Registrum Johannis Pecham*, 219

Diocesis Londoniensis: *Registrum Radulphi Baldock, Gilberti Segrave, Ricardi Newport et Stephani Gravesend*, 219

DIVORCE, ON CERTAIN ASPECTS OF [by Lady Laura Ridding],

- 414 sqq.: marriage as a civil contract, 414; evidence of Sir James Crichton Browne, 415; novels dealing with divorce, 416; tendency of modern civilization, 417; *A Modern Instance* quoted, 418; *A Modern Chronicle* quoted, 419; Puritans and luxury, 420; arguments in favour of repudiation of wifely obligations, 421; the after-effects of divorce, 422; passion not responsible for majority of divorces, 423; society difficulties of *divorcées*, 425; incompatibility as a reason for divorce, 426; belief in marriage as a sacred institution weakened, 427; evidence of Mr. John Rose, 428
- DOWDEN, Rt. Rev. Dr. John, *The Church Year and Calendar*, 455
- DUDDEN, Rev. Dr. F. H., *Christ and Christ's Religion: Sermons*, 452
- FOWLER, Rev. MONTAGUE, *The Morality of Social Pleasures*, 463
- Galatians, The Epistle to the* (ed. by Rev. A. Lukyn Williams), 204
- GASCOYNE-CECIL, Rev. Lord WILLIAM, *Changing China*, 228
- GINSBURG, Dr. C. D., *Isaias*, 430
- GLADSTONE'S LETTERS ON CHURCH AND RELIGION, MR., 257 sqq.: Mr. Gladstone's method and power of concentration, 258; faulty arrangement of letters, 259; Mr. Gladstone's connexion with the Oxford Movement, 260; Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 261; Morley's *Life of Gladstone* quoted, 261 sqq.; (Cardinal) Manning and James Hope, 262; religion in political debate, 263; *The State in its Relations with the Church*, 264; the State and religion, 265; letter to James Hope, 266; Mr. Gladstone on Cardinal Newman, 267; Newman's secession, 268; Mr. Gladstone's firm belief in the Church, 269; the Gorham Judgement, 270; attitude of Roman converts towards Anglican Church, 271
- GRAFTON, Rt. Rev. C. C., *A Journey Godward*, 235
- GREEN, Rt. Rev. ARTHUR VINCENT, *The Ephesian Canonical Writings*, 204
- GREGG, Rev. J. A. F., *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 200
- Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (ed. by J. A. Fuller Maitland), 461
- HAMILTON, Dr. MARY, *Greek Saints and their Festivals*, 444
- HANAUER, J. E., *Folk-Lore of the Holy Land*, 443
- HENDERSON, CHARLES RICHMOND, *Social Duties from the Christian Point of View*, 463
- HOLE, Rev. CHARLES, *A Manual of English Church History*, 469
- HUGHSON, Rev. S. C., *The Warfare of the Soul. Practical Studies in the Life of Temptation*, 225
- HUNT, Rev. JASPER B., *Existence after Death implied by Science*, 438
- Hymns Ancient and Modern for Use in the Services of the Church with Accompanying Tunes*, 459
- JELF, Mrs., *George Edward Jelf. A Memoir*, 234
- JEWISH VIEW OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, A [by Rev. H. L. Goudge], 1 sqq.: C. G. Montefiore quoted, 2; his contribution to Biblical criticism, 3; his views on the character and teaching of our Lord, 4 sq.; his approval of our Lord's

- teaching on divorce, 6; the Synoptic Gospels demand a critical treatment, 7; different starting-points of Jew and Christian, 8; St. Paul on the observance of the law, 9; religion of law and of divine life, 10; is an objective view of the Synoptic Gospels impossible? 11; the difficulties of the 'advanced critics' 12; M. Loisy quoted, *ib.*; *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 13; Johannes Weiss quoted, 14; exaggeration in Apostolic Church, 15 *sq.*; the miracles of our Lord, 17 *sq.*; Dr. Carpenter on the feeding of the five thousand, 19; our Lord's mission and His claims, 21 *sq.*; Liberal Judaism and Unitarian Christianity, 23 *sq.*; *Truth in Religion and other Sermons*, 25
- JUDAISTIC CONTROVERSY AND THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL, THE [by Rev. Kirsopp Lake], 345 *sqq.*: earliest Christian community was in Jerusalem, 345; Jewish persecution of Christians, 346; baptism of Cornelius, 347 *sq.*; limitation of Church membership to Jews found untenable, 348; St. Barnabas and St. Paul at Antioch, 349; *Oracula Sibyllina*, 350; different type of Christianity at Antioch from that at Jerusalem, 351; growth of the Antiochene movement and St. Paul's first missionary journey, 352; Apostolic council at Jerusalem, 353; rules laid down for Gentile converts, 354; evidence for and against a food law made by Council, 355 *sq.*; G. Resch, *Aposteldecree*, 357; text of Tertullian is ambiguous, 358; what was the form of the Council's decree, 369; Noachic regulations and Apostolic decrees compared, 360 *sq.*; evidence that 'things strangled' were forbidden in food law, 362; Jewish Christians' attitude towards Antiochene movement, 366; that of non-Christian Jews, 367; Jewish hatred of St. Paul, 368; Josephus and Juvenal quoted, 369; Messianic teaching, 370; summary, *ib.*
- KER, A., *Papuan Fairy Tales*, 448
- KING, Dr. I., *The Development of Religion: a Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology*, 441
- LAWSON, J. C., *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, 443
- LEES, Rev. G. ROBINSON, *The Witness of the Wilderness*, 215
- LINDSAY, Lady MABEL M., *Anni Domini: a Gospel Study*, 437
- LOMBARDIC ARCHITECTURE, 371 *sqq.*: tribute to Signor Rivoira, 371; English translation of his book, 372; arrangement of subject-matter, 373; Romanesque influence on Constantinople and the East, 374; Lombardo-Norman style in Burgundy, 375; plates in Italian edition of Rivoira's work, 376; Julianus Argentarius, 377; Basilica Ursiana in Ravenna, 378; Miss Bell in *The Thousand and One Churches*, 379; origin of Comacine gilds, 380; San Pietro at Toscanella, 381; development of vaulting, 382; pre-Conquest Architecture in Britain, 383; first cathedral of Canterbury, 384; St. Benet's, Cambridge, and St. Michael's, Oxford, 385; Lombardo-Norman style in England, 386; Durham Cathedral, *ib.*; architectural development in

- England in eleventh and twelfth centuries, 387
- MACCALLUM, Dr. M. W., *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background*, 483
- MACLEAN, Rev. DOUGLAS, *Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction*, 223
- MANGENOT, ABBÉ E., *La Résurrection de Jésus*, 201
- MARCZALI, HENRY, *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century*, 223
- MASTERMAN, Dr. E. W. G., *Studies in Galilee*, 205
- Memorials of Old Cheshire* (ed. by Ven. Edward Barber and Rev. P. H. Ditchfield), 221
- Memorials of Old Durham* (ed. by Henry R. Leighton), 481
- MERCER, Right Rev. Dr. J. E., *The Science of Life and the Larger Hope*, 226
- MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, THE WORLD [by Mrs. Creighton], 55 sqq. : the awakening in the East, 57 ; Mahomedan activity in India and Africa, 58 ; Hon. T. H. Yun quoted, 59 ; missionary advance during the last decade, 60 ; the appointment of Commissions and the methods adopted, 61 ; procedure at the Conference, 62 ; the Bishop of Birmingham on the Anglican missionary effort, 63 ; Mr. Malden, 'Study of Foreign Missions,' 64 ; Britain's responsibility in India, 65 ; importance of medical work, *ib.* ; Report of Commission on Education, 66 ; 'The Missionary Message in Relation to non-Christian Religions,' 67 sq. ; Bishop of Lahore quoted, 69 ; zeal in Manchuria and Korea, 70 ; lack of missionary literature, 71 ; Mr. Seth Low and Mr. Dahle, 72 ; Dutch missions in the East Indies, 73 ; Board of Missionary Study, 74 ; Report on the Home Base of Missions, 76 ; laymen's missionary movement in America, 77 ; Bishop Brent of the Philippines on the Roman Church, 78 ; Commission on Co-operation, 79 sq. ; formation of Continuation Committee, 81 ; Archbishop of Canterbury quoted, 82
- MORRIS, J. E., *County Churches. Surrey*, 477
- NAVILLE, Dr. ÉDOUARD, *The Old Egyptian Faith* (trans. by Rev. Dr. Colin Campbell), 208
- ODES OF SOLOMON, THE [by Rev. Dr. A. C. Headlam], 272 sqq. : testimony of Lactantius, 273 ; *Pistis Sophia*, 274 ; probable date of the *Odes*, 275 ; characteristics of the *Odes*, 276 ; Professor Harnack's theory, 277 ; no references to Jewish ceremonial life or law, 278 ; arguments against Jewish authorship, 279 ; those for a Christian source, 280 ; Dr. Emery Barnes, 280 sq. ; reference to the Temple at Leontopolis, 281 ; Professor Nairne quoted, 282 sq. ; illustration of alleged interpolation, 283 sq. ; internal evidence of Christianity, 285 ; Are all the *Odes* the work of one writer ? 286 ; Ignatius on the Trinity, 287 ; literary customs of last centuries of Judaism, 288 ; symbolical language used in expressing ideas, 289 ; the canonical Psalter imitated but not quoted, 290 ; analogies to the Fourth Gospel, 291 ; view of Dr. Bernard, 291 sq. ; allusions to baptismal ritual, 292 ; conclusions arrived at, 293 ; descent into Hades, 293 sq. ; character of the author, 294 ; his mode of expression, 295 ; note of

Penitence not frequent, 296 ;
thought and aspirations of
early Christianity, 297
ORCHARD, H. LANGHORNE, *The
Attitude of Science towards
Miracles*, 437

PAGET, Right Rev. Dr. H. L.,
Home Life in England, 230

PENSTONE, Miss M. M., *Town
Study*, 463

PERIODICALS, 240, 485

'POLICRATICUS' OF JOHN OF
SALISBURY, THE [by Mr.
Clement C. J. Webb], 312 sqq. :
historical interest of the *Poli-
craticus*, 312 ; *Entheticus de
Dogmate Philosophorum*, 313 ;
Archbishop Parker's copy of
the *Policraticus*, 314 ; its
subject-matter, 315 ; John's
enumeration of omens, 316 ;
the prophetic dream, 317 ;
dream interpretation, 318 ;
astrology—free will and ne-
cessity, 319 ; Ben Jonson,
320 ; mirror-witchcraft, 321 ;
censure of flatterers, 322 ;
a prince's duty to God and his
country, 323 ; the *Institutio
Trajani*, 324 ; venality of
English officials, 325 ; Harold's
Welsh campaign, 326 ; a
soldier's oath of loyalty, 327 ;
legend of Brennus, 328 ;
Nicholas Breakspear, 329, 343 ;
Historia Pontificalis, 330 ;
John on ancient philosophy,
331 ; criticism of Abelard,
332 ; John attacks religious
place-hunters, 333 ; King
Roger's treatment of simoni-
acal candidates for see of
Avellana, 334 ; John on hypo-
crisy, 335 ; praise of Carthus-
ians and Order of Grammont,
336 ; pleasure and gluttony
censured, 337 ; John's wide
classical reading, 338 ; tyrants
described, 339 ; Frederick Bar-
barossa, 340 ; examples of
tyrants, 341 ; conflicts for

Papal chair, 342 ; Hadrian IV
on responsibility of pontifi-
cate, 343 ; Bernard Silvester,
ib. ; John on Henry II, 344
PRAYER BOOK REVISION, THE
PROSPECTS AND PRINCIPLES
OF [by Rev. Dr. C. R. Davey
Biggs and Rev. W. C. Bishop],
82 sqq. : Pan-Anglican Con-
gress of 1908, 84 ; Committee
on Prayer Book Adaptation
and Enrichment, 85 ; Resolu-
tion of the Lambeth Con-
ference regarding revision, 86 ;
Convocation Committee's Re-
port, 87 ; Scottish Episcopal
Church proposals, 88 sq. ;
London Diocesan Conference,
90 ; plan of Lord Halifax, 91 ;
Lambeth Conferences quoted,
92 ; verdict of the Ecclesias-
tical Discipline Commission,
93 ; resolution of the Salisbury
Diocesan Synod, 95 ; Oxford
Memorial, 96.

Rev. Dr. S. Hart, *The
Book of Common Prayer*, 97 ;
Bishop Cosin and the revision
of 1662, 99 sq. ; lesson to be
learnt from this revision, 100 ;
suggested order of services,
101 ; our liturgy compared
with *Paroissien Romain*, 102 ;
the place of the Lord's Prayer
and the invocation, 104 ; use
of the doxology, 105 ; *The
Right of the Parish Clerk to
read the Epistle*, 106 ; detailed
outlines of revision, 107 sqq. ;
rearrangement of the Psalms
and the Canticles, 109 ; the
Litany and the Ante-Com-
munion Service, 110 ; the
Communion Service, 111 sq. ;
what should be the character
of an 'Alternative Liturgy,'
113 sq. ; *How we got our
Prayer Book*, 114 ; reform of
the Lectionary, 115 sq. ; proper
lessons for all festivals sug-
gested, 118 ; mission field,
needs of, 119

RAMSAY, Sir W. M., *The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey*, 226

ROLLE OF HAMPOLE, RICHARD, *The Form of Perfect Living*, 484

RUSSELL, CHARLES E. B., *Young Gaol Birds*, 463

Saint Theresa : the History of her Foundations (trans. by Sister Agnes Mason), 468

SCHECHTER, S., *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, 433

SCOTT, FREDERICK GEORGE, *Poems*, 484

SCOTTISH CONSECRATIONS IN LONDON IN 1610, THE [by Rev. Thomas Hannan], 387 *sqq.*: John Spottiswood, Gavin Hamilton, and Andrew Lamb, 389; King James V summoned a National Council, 390; 'Lords of the Congregation,' 391; first General Assembly, *ib.*; Confession of Faith drawn up, 392; John Knox and the 'tulchan' bishops, 393; 'Petition of the Nine Articles,' *ib.*; Andrew Melville and 'Act of Assembly,' 394; James VI succeeds to throne of England, 395; misrepresentation by Calderwood and Row, 396; Scottish bishops libelled, 397; George Gladstones, 398 *sq.*; David Lindsay, 399; James Law, Andrew Knox, and Peter Blackburn, 400; Dr. Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, 401; Archbishop Whitgift on Dr. Bancroft, 402; George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, 403; Lancelot Andrewes, *ib.*; historical importance of Scottish consecrations, 404; discussion on legality of same, 405; a bishop should not come to office *per saltum*, 406; case of St. Ambrose, 406 *sq.*; Histories of Socrates and

Sozomen, 408; cases of Cyprian and Nectarius, 409; latitude taken by acting bishops in 1610, 410; Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, 411; recognition of consecrations has a bearing on question of Reunion, 412; Macaulay's 'Gladstone on Church and State,' 413

SHORTER, CLEMENT, *Highways and Byways in Buckinghamshire*, 237

SKINNER, Rev. Dr. JOHN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 195

SKRINE, Rev. J. H., *Sermons to Pastors and Masters*, 450

SMITH, Rev. D., *Man's Need of God*, 454

SMITH, Rev. Dr. S. G., *Religion in the Making*, 442

TABRUM, ARTHUR H., *Religious Beliefs of Scientists*, 440

THORBURN, Rev. Dr. T. J., *The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism*, 435

Thousand and One Churches, The (by Sir W. M. Ramsay and Miss Gertrude L. Bell), 216

TIRARD, Mrs. H. M., *The Book of the Dead*, 446

TRAINING AND EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS, THE [by Rev. Dr. A. C. Headlam], 119 *sqq.*: changes in the supply of candidates, 121; modern clerical requirements, 122; Bishop's Central Entrance Examination, 123; the Universities' Preliminary, 124; *Absente Reo* quoted, 125; papers set in Universities' Preliminary, 126; analysis of the Thirty-nine Articles by Mr. Tait of Ridley Hall, 128; remedies proposed, *ib.*; different standards of pass degrees, 129; medical and clerical training compared, 130; one universal

- examination considered, 131 ;
Graduate Theological Colleges,
132 ; teaching at King's College,
133 ; suggestions regarding
Oxford and Cambridge, 133 ;
Faculty of Theology at Man-
chester, 134 ; residential hos-
tels, 134 sq. ; formation of
a Central Council suggested,
137 sq. ; Bishops' Examina-
tions, 138 sq.
- Typical English Churchmen*, 470
- VASSALL-PHILLIPS, Rev. O. R.,
*Mr. Conybeare on Mark iii. 21
and Luke xi. 27, 28 : some
Positive Methods of a Negative
Critic*, 203
- VIREY, PHILIPPE, *La Religion
de l'ancienne Égypte*, 212
- WALKER, Dr. HUGH, *The Liter-
ature of the Victorian Era*, 232
- WEIGALL, ARTHUR E. P., *A
Guide to the Antiquities of
Upper Egypt*, 207
- WELLDON, Rt. Rev. Bishop, *The
Gospel in a Great City*, 463
- WESTCOTT, Rt. Rev. Dr. B. F.,
*The Two Empires : the Church
and the World*, 467
- WESTPHAL, Professor, *Jéhovah*
(trans. by Clement Du Pontet),
198
- WHITE, Rt. Rev. GILBERT, *The
World's Tragedy : and other
Poems*, 484
- Yalkut of R. Machir Bar Abba
Mari on Zechariah, The* (ed. by
Rev. Dr. A. W. Greenup), 432